

THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the REV. S. C. CARPENTER, D.D., MASTER OF THE TEMPLE, c/o S.P.C.K.
HOUSE, NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, LONDON, W.C. 2, to whom MSS.
should be sent.

Vol. XXVIII

JUNE, 1934

No. 168

EDITORIAL

A LETTER from Canon Newell Long which is printed on another page will probably command the sympathy of our readers. But it is not within our power to give him much assistance. The custom of THEOLOGY, in reviewing a book, is to indicate facts and, for the rest, without becoming uncritical, to go as far as possible in the direction of finding merit. This, we submit, was done by the reviewer of Mr. Richardson's book in a skilful and constructive way. Ought the editorial columns to have done more? It would not have been impossible to add some general comments, and we are sure that if this had been done the reviewer would not have complained. A reviewer in the January number, whose argument in the matter of Dr. N. P. Williams' essay in *Northern Catholicism* was considerably qualified by the Editor, took it in the most generous way. Nevertheless, though not impossible, it would have been a delicate and difficult thing to do. Moreover, the Editor had not then read the book. Accordingly, he made no comment.

Canon Long's letter, however, has the effect of raising a larger question. Our general aim is to offer such comments on a selection from current theological questions as are thought likely to suggest to intelligent readers the true conclusion. We are anxious not to form the habit of measuring everything that happens by the same foot-rule, or of offering machine-made verdicts on all contemporary events. This, we are sure, Canon Long does not desire that we should do. But we do not even think that we are called upon to act as judge in the affairs of a particular diocese. What we may fairly be expected to do, when the question of clerical subscription has been definitely raised by a correspondent, is to indicate the principles on which we believe that readers may justly form their own conclusions.

The principle is this. Every age is an age of transition, and every age thinks that it is peculiarly so. Aware of the temptation to claim uniqueness, we nevertheless think that our own age is at least more of a junction, at which the command "all change" is heard, than most other periods of which we have read. This being so, if a priest remains silent in print about one or more articles of the Creed, we have no wish to enquire into the significance of his silence. He may have nothing particular to say. No one is obliged to print his view of everything. Even if he has actual uncertainties, our normal, unspoken comment would be that the matter is difficult, the clergy cannot be expected to have, at all times, an equal grip on every article of the Faith, and the priest in question may be holding on in hope of recovery. Accordingly, we deprecate inquisition. At the same time the public has a claim to be considered. A taxi-driver holds a license. It assures the public that he can drive his car and that he knows his way about the city. Solicitors and doctors in like manner have their professional qualifications, which cause them to be trusted. If a priest says, especially if he says in a defiant way, that he disbelieves one or more articles of the Creed, our judgment is that he is abusing the confidence which is reposed in him. We find ourselves unable to understand the workings of his conscience when he recites the Creed, as we assume that he does at Matins and Evensong daily, or from time to time where it occurs in the Liturgy.

Can anything be done? It is not for us to attempt to dictate the course which any particular diocese ought to follow. But we imagine that the bishop, as one of the consecrated guardians of the Faith, would naturally be concerned about it. He might well ask the priest to explain how he justifies his position. In case the bishop should fear that his own zeal for orthodoxy, or any other cause, may perhaps tempt him to take a prejudiced view, he might summon a number of theologians to his aid. There are Bishops' meetings at Lambeth. The Doctrine Commission, now sitting, might consent to help, or the Divinity Professors at one of the Universities, or a theological committee of Convocation. If the bishop, in whom we are assuming an almost infinite patience in any case of conscience, is eventually satisfied that the priest deliberately intends to teach something other than the teaching of the Church, he should then charge it upon the conscience of the priest to resign his benefice. It seems to us that the whole matter lies *in foro conscientiae*. Now conscience is a delicate

thing. It will not respond to pressure of the wrong kind. Such weapons as ridicule, anger, threats, are both unworthy and ineffective. The only kind of pressure which is fair and has any prospect of success is ethical, conscientious pressure, directed towards the conversion of the offender. The bishop should no doubt guard by every means in his power against the danger of acting as an irresponsible autocrat. He should fortify himself by Catholic tradition, by the canons of Anglican interpretation, by the counsel of his peers, by the voice of his Synod, by the most trustworthy current theology, by his own best judgment. It will take him a long time to be quite sure. When he is quite sure, let him smite. But let him smite according to the authority which the Lord hath given him to edification, and not to destruction. It may be thought that such smiting may be ineffective. We do not think so. There are indeed other weapons, but they are not congenial to the Church of God. We wrestle neither against, nor with the aid of, flesh and blood.

So far we have spoken only of the obligation of the priest. His status is official; he represents the Church in his parish; he teaches; what he says and does is more than personal. The layman is, perhaps not wholly but for the most part, a private individual. When the author of *Ecce Homo* was said to have concealed his religious opinions, he replied that he had only done so as the great majority of people do; he had not published them. This is indeed the ordinary case, and thus the layman's precise theological position is not likely to become known. Moreover, if he should be at any time in a state of uncertainty, it is comparatively easy for him to maintain his religious practice in the hope of regaining theological health. There is in this way a practical difference, and it is fortunate that the cure for the layman is easier, because he is more likely to ail. But scientifically there is no difference. There is only one truth, only one orthodoxy. There is really no such thing as clerical faith, clerical orthodoxy. There is only Christian faith, Christian orthodoxy.

What is orthodoxy? It arises ultimately from conversion, the state of being irresistibly drawn to One who is recognized as the Way, the Truth, the Life. It takes its special form through the conviction that Christianity is a consistent whole. The Catholic Church and the Catholic Faith represent the way in which Christ is held towards us today. We have not invented it. It is not true of those who call themselves Liberal Catholics that they have exercised their ingenuity, have confined their

criticism and their restatement to things which are not central, and have contrived in all that matters to reach the orthodox conclusion. Their attitude is based on authority. And yet at the same time it is based on freedom. An authority which remains external has no saving power. And so they have done and keep on doing their utmost to make the Creed their own. Bishop Gore explains in the Preface to *Belief in God* that he has been a lifelong Catholic, and a lifelong free thinker. His appreciation of what was at stake made him not less but more critical of the methods to be used in the attainment of certainty. It was no doubt something of a defect in him that he did less than justice to Mysticism, and the von Hügel method. But he remains a wholesome reminder of the necessity of independent thinking. Here is a definition of orthodoxy: "Orthodoxy is the earnest desire of a communicant to believe as faithfully and to understand as clearly as he can what the Church of his Baptism, being a part of the Catholic Church, and holding in her hand and constantly appealing to, the Bible, teaches as true." It is perhaps not completely water-tight. It comes out of a young man's book, *A Parson's Defence*, published in 1912. Readers may care to try their hands at mending it. We do not want a voluminous correspondence on the nature of orthodoxy, still less on the condition of affairs in the diocese of Birmingham, but we would gladly give a page or two to a series of definitions of Christian orthodoxy sent in by our readers. If this is taken up seriously, we suggest that contributors should try especially to illuminate the following point. Bishop Lightfoot said at the end of his devoted life that there were a very few things of which he was quite, quite sure, and those few were enough. Assuming that this is true, most of us would proceed to argue that there are a number of outlying things, not central, not fundamental, which take their natural place on the circumference when the centre is assured. Is this grouping a sound process, and how is it to be described? Remember, we are asking for definitions, not discussions.

The homely poet who longed that some benevolent power would give us the gift of seeing ourselves as others see us never thought that it would come to pass. Nor has it, quite. But really, as you read *Æcumenica*, you almost think it has. To read, over the well-known signature of "Cosmo Cantuar:", of "notre Eglise d'Angleterre telle qu'elle est, avec toute la richesse de sa pensée théologique et de ses coutumes liturgiques," is a surprising and encouraging thing. We turn a few pages

and find the Archbishop of York saying that the Church of England "fait œuvre éminemment créatrice, favorisant la synthèse d'éléments distincts, mais non opposés, hâtant la naissance d'un Catholicisme évangélique et libéral qui, pour beaucoup, est la grande espérance de demain." An editorial article points out that "L'Anglican en général est très fermement attaché à la doctrine chrétienne traditionnelle, mais il est convaincu qu'aux périodes de transition comme la nôtre, il est plus sage de tolérer quelques imprudences de langage et même certaines audaces doctrinales dangereuses plutôt que d'imposer un silence arbitraire par des mesures de discipline extérieure et ainsi d'enchaîner la liberté de l'Esprit Saint. *Veritas prævalet.*" There is a very sympathetic article by the Metropolitan of Thyatira on Anglo-Orthodox relations, and articles by the Bishop of Truro and the Dean of Chichester. These are all in different ways expositions of the situation, most lucid and readable. Of a more general kind are discussions of *Amitiés Suédoises*, L'Évêque Handley Moule (*Un Saint Évangélique*), and Philipps de Lisle, an admirable selection of topics. A chronicle of "Œcumenical" events and a few reviews conclude the first number. It is the new quarterly periodical published by S.P.C.K. for the Council of Foreign Relations, to promote the cause of Œcumenical Reunion, and to inform Continental readers what the Church of England stands for. It has been translated into French, and it is printed in France. Everyone should read it. The "abonnement annuel" is 15 francs, or 4s. "Le numéro" is 4 francs, or 1s. 6, Rue Daviel, Paris xiii., or S.P.C.K.

The Editor is asked by the Publishers to insert the following statement:

We regret to announce that the most strenuous efforts to obtain advertisements for THEOLOGY have been in vain. Rather than waste more time on the quest we have decided to give four additional pages of reading matter. Two pages of the cover will be available for advertisements to those who apply; we shall not seek them. The usual response of a publisher to such failure as ours is to close down the periodical; but we do not intend to do this. Rather we appeal to our readers to do their utmost to get new subscribers to compensate for the missing revenue.

The causes of our failure are instructive:

1. Probably publishers, from whom alone we can expect advertisements, do not realize the value of a magazine

with a restricted circulation which nevertheless "counts." Our circulation is a little below 2,000, but we reckon that we have at least 10,000 readers, since most copies are passed round to many readers.

2. Our reviews are generally four to six months late, and sometimes much later. So much is a notice from us prized that we are now receiving review copies to the number of 400 a year—a remarkable record for a magazine with our title. We are quite overwhelmed by the avalanche. Further, considerable care is taken in the choice of reviewers and a good deal of delay ensues sometimes before the right man is found. He then reads the book (by no means a universal practice on the part of reviewers), and writes a notice to which, with full sense of responsibility, he appends his name. A busy man cannot always guarantee to do this speedily. But our conscientiousness is our ruin commercially, since most publishers are not interested in a review which appears six months after publication. The fashionable modern method is to launch an intensive selling campaign at the outset and to disregard, or even scrap, books which have not attained an immediate success.
3. The most important cause, however, is the intimate connection between reviews and advertisements. Our advertising manager has been asked at times, "If we advertise, will it make any difference to the reviews?" and has answered "No." "Then why should we spend money if you will recommend our books anyhow?" Or he has been frankly told that better reviews must be given if advertisements are to be forthcoming.

We are happy to belong to the select band of papers whose reviews are unaffected by commercial considerations. Our readers can decide for themselves whether the judgment of the reviewers of the more important books is worth anything, and they can rest assured that we should be horrified at the bare suggestion of letting reviews be influenced by advertisements.

REPARATION

(A PAPER READ BEFORE THE WEST LAWRES
READING SOCIETY)

I

I HOPE you will forgive me for choosing a devotional subject for my paper. My excuse for venturing to address fellow priests on such a topic is that I have been trying to learn something about Reparation for some years, and to attempt to put one's thoughts into words clears one's own mind as nothing else can.

There has been during the last generation, I suppose largely as a result of the Oxford Movement, a revival in England of interest in Moral and Ascetic Theology, and our branch of the Church has produced works of no mean order on these subjects, in accordance with our English and Anglican methods of thought. Interest in the latter has called attention to Reparation. The name is perhaps rather modern; the older spiritual writers referred to it, I believe, as part of Penitence. The thing itself is as old as the Faith; in fact, I believe we could say it has its roots in the Church of the Old Dispensation. It is a fact that Reparation is attracting devout souls today, and, like all other spiritual activities, it has its dangers if it is not properly understood and carefully set about.

What is Reparation? Quite simply, in its ordinary connotation it means to make good some loss or injury. We ought to know something of its significance, as we have heard plenty about it since the Great War. We have almost got tired of seeing the word Reparations in the newspapers. The Central Powers, after their defeat, had this discipline laid upon them, they were called upon to make good, so far as possible, the damage they had done. So we see, straight away, that in the most ordinary sense Reparation has a penitential meaning. It is connected with wrongdoing, an attempt to redress the balance which Sin has brought down on the wrong side.

When we turn from nations or large groups to individuals, we see that between persons Reparation is part of true Penitence. Apart from other places, this is quite clearly brought out in the Book of Common Prayer. If we turn to the second and third rubrics at the beginning of the Order of the Administration of the Holy Communion, we find that the notorious evil liver, who is to be warned against presenting himself at the Altar, is to be told that he is to remain without the Bread of Life until he has made open confession of his fault and repent-

ance, and also, "have recompensed the parties to whom he hath done wrong; or at least declare himself to be in full purpose to do so, as soon as he conveniently may." Those between whom malice and hatred reigns are also to be kept away until they are ready to forgive, and until each "be content to make amends for that he himself hath offended."

Again, when we turn to the Order for the Visitation of the Sick, we find that after the examination of the sick man's Faith comes an examination of his repentance. In exhorting the soul thereto the priest is instructed to urge, "where he hath done injury or wrong to any man, that he make amends to the uttermost of his power."

We may say, then, from the first, that Reparation finds a solemn and important place in the Prayer Book.

II

Having looked at the word in its general meaning, we may now ask, What exactly do we mean by it as applied to the spiritual life of the Christian?

Like all the deep things of God, including the Divine Fatherhood, it has a simple counterpart or type in the natural life. The Life of the Divine-Human Saviour in our souls is supernatural, not unnatural. It restores our true nature, which is ours in virtue of our creation in the Image of God, however much it is twisted and impoverished by Sin. So it will be in this matter of Reparation.

I suppose the simplest form of Reparation is that of a child offered to its mother. Imagine a woman overcome by some great trouble. She is discovered in tears by her small child. The sorrow is far beyond the little one's comprehension, but the mother's tears are not. The child comes, and in its own way tries to comfort the mother with its little acts of love. Instead of going out to play, it occupies itself busily for a time; and then returns and says: "Mummy, I have drawn you such a nice picture, look at it and then you won't cry any more." Now the child's efforts with pencil and paper will not really assuage the mother's pain; but the love and sacrifice, the unstudied attempt to share the trouble, will bring a ray of joy to her distracted heart, which perhaps nothing else could do. Please bear this illustration in mind in considering all that I have to say.

From a rather different angle we may take as an illustration the Knight Errant of the old romances. He set out on all sorts of difficult and dangerous quests in order to prove to his lady love the depth of his affection. She was to be assured of his devotion by the measure of what he was prepared to do or to suffer. This

also we must keep in mind, if we are to understand the more advanced form which Reparation has taken in the lives of the Saints.

III

I imagine that there will be no question in our minds as to the propriety and necessity of our offering Reparation to our fellow men; but the word is used, and I want to speak of the matter, as it applies to our relationship to God. In what sense, if any, can it apply to Him?

As soon as we begin to have any intelligent knowledge of God, and the things of God, we realize that we find ourselves in a world which He has made—but which is averted from Him.

If, escaping the quicksands of Pantheism on the one hand, and the desert of Deism on the other, we rise to faith in a Personal Creator, who has brought all things into being with a purpose which is good and loving, then we cannot blink the fact that the intelligences which He has made are pursuing almost any end rather than His. Nay, there exists what looks like incipient moral evil in the instinctive lives of animals; and even, it would seem, in plant life, and perhaps lower in the scale. If God be perfect Goodness, Truth and Beauty, then there resides in Him all possible Majesty and Dominion. Yet that Majesty is ever being insulted and that dominion is being constantly flouted, throughout the world of human souls at any rate.

But we Christians make a deeper claim. We declare that God has revealed Himself as Infinite Love. If this be true, how utterly beyond all description must be the wounds which the sin and folly of men are ever inflicting upon His Heart.

We must give some thought to the answer to this question of the possibility of offering Reparation to God. It is not altogether simple. In the Articles of Religion we are told that "God is without Body, Parts, or Passions." Philosophers, I imagine, generally agree in attributing to the Godhead an existence of perfect bliss; a life in which suffering or pain could not in any sense be present. I believe that the majority of theologians hold the same view—viz., that God in His Essential Deity is Impassible. I believe there have always been some who would question or qualify that statement. A suggestion that the subject should be reopened appeared not very long ago in THEOLOGY. The war raised the problem in an acute form, and the gist of the teaching of such popular writers as Studdert-Kennedy was that God suffered in and with His children. However that may be, Reparation does not depend on any fine or moot theological or philosophical point. Whatever may be the rights of the above remarks, it is certain that

in His Incarnate Life, God was, and so is, capable of suffering. Indeed, so much was suffering the keynote of His earthly experience that His followers have not hesitated to apply to Him Isaiah's prophecy of the Man of Sorrows.

We are, of course, using human categories, and, if we have ever worshipped, we know that they are almost an impertinence as applied to the Eternal Majesty; yet may it not be that we get near to a great truth, if we dare to say that God, unable to suffer in His Divine Nature, took flesh that He might suffer.

The Incarnate Lord can suffer. That would be universally admitted, no doubt. Let us remember that He has not ceased to be Incarnate. Abbé Giloteaux lays it down that the doctrine and practice of Reparation rests upon the doctrine and practice of the Church as the Body of Christ. "The Church," he says, "is the very Life of God revealing Himself in a section of humanity attached to Him by spiritual ties. It is God the Father shewing Himself to the world in the Person of His Son, through the mysteries of Incarnation and Redemption; and stirring souls by means of the secret operations of the Holy Spirit. The life of the Father flows into Jesus, flows from and Jesus to us; by Nature into Him, by adoption into us. "I am the Vine, ye are the branches." That is, the Person of Jesus, once dwelling in Bethlehem, now living in the Eucharist, does not make up the whole Christ. The whole Christ consists of Jesus and ourselves, united to Him in His Mystical Body. "Victim Souls." So, also, Pascal says, "Christ will be in agony until the end of the world." St. Leo, also: "The Passion of the Saviour will continue until the end of time."

We may put the call to Christians to offer Reparation in syllogistic form:

(a) By Baptism we enter Holy Church, become members of Christ, and so receive His Life. Therefore to continue faithful to Him and not fall away we must experience His sentiments and dispositions, and perform His actions.

(b) The Life sentiments and dispositions of Jesus were those of a victim: "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give His Life a ransom for many." Christ "loved us and gave Himself up for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God, an odour of a sweet smell" (Eph. v. 1). "How much more shall the Blood of Christ, who through the Eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to God, purge your consciences," etc. (Heb. ix. 14).

(c) Therefore our supernatural life will be a victim life. "Now ye are the Body of Christ, and members in particular" (1 Cor. xii. 27). "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God, which liveth and

abideth for ever" (1 Pet. i. 23). "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus" (Phil. ii. 5).

It is tempting, of course, to ask why our Lord should have suffered. There we come up against the profound mystery of the Atonement. Reparation rests upon the fact, not upon any theory of the fact. We have our Lord's own word for it that His Death was a Sacrifice for Sin. We can see that the entry of Sin, whatever our theories about it may be, means that in the spiritual world everything has gone wrong. Infinite Majesty is flouted and insulted. Infinite Justice cannot be satisfied by any sacrifice or Reparation sinful man can make by himself. It requires the Sacrifice of One whose Divinity gives His Sacrifice an Infinite value. The truth that Infinite Justice must be satisfied before man can be restored is not popular nowadays, partly because of our slipshod thinking, and partly because of what Dean Inge calls the secularization of religion. We perhaps need to remind ourselves, in our reflections on the Atonement, that if the Divine Justice is only a legal fiction, or something which can be dodged, then there is no such thing possible as absolute justice between man and man. Nay, it would seem to mean, further, that the Divine Love can hardly be more than a sentimentality, and may possibly be immoral!

IV

Reparation recognizes, then, and meditates on the Sufferings of Christ for us, and love is stirred with desire to share them that they may be lightened. Here is the natural human basis to which I referred. St. Teresa says, "I used to find myself most at home in the prayer of the Garden, whither I went in His company. I wished, if it had been possible, to wipe away that painful sweat from His brow."

The word Reparation is new, and dates, I believe, to a Devotion which grew up in the Roman Communion as a result of certain visions granted to St. Margaret Mary, the Devotion to the Sacred Heart. To us, at first sight, the symbolism seems crude. Perhaps we have seen, and been offended by, some statue of our Lord with breast bared, and a strange-looking burning Heart displayed. If we look closely we shall see that the device is a heart bursting into flame, surmounted by a cross, and surrounded by a crown of thorns. Here, surely, is the symbolism of Gethsemane and Calvary, and the flame of Divine Charity which embraced both.

Though the word is new, Reparation has always been present in the Church. There have always been victims of love, souls ready to add the sacrifice of themselves to the perfect Sacrifice

of the Cross, that Christ may go on bearing it in His members, that some return or acknowledgment may be made to Him for His Infinite Pain. Go back to the very beginning. At the Cross itself there stood the Blessed Virgin, the sword piercing her own soul. Also St. Mary Magdalene and St. John, all silently suffering with the Divine Victim.

Simon of Cyrene and the holy women associated themselves with His sufferings.

The Apostles fled, it is true, but they returned, as victims to preach to every nation, and to lay down their lives. St. Stephen led the great band of martyrs who gave their lives in the age of persecution.

After Constantine's Edict of Toleration there arose those who have been called the victims of repentance, the solitaries of the Egyptian desert, with their almost incredible austerities.

Monasticism succeeded eremitism, founded by such sacrificial souls as SS. Basil and Benedict.

In the Middle Ages, when love had grown cold, and God and Mammon were served together, there arose SS. Francis and Dominic, displaying the spirit of Reparation in their effort and call to share almost literally the burden of the Cross.

In view of the break-up of Christendom at the Reformation, St. Ignatius appears and founds the Society of Jesus, to preach perpetual obedience and renunciation.

Since then there have been St. Teresa and St. John of the Cross to pass on the torch.

Almost in our own day we may add to the list Jean Vianney, Curé d'Ars, and Teresa of Lisieux.

These are outstanding figures. Of course there are untold numbers of whom the world and the Church on earth know little or nothing. Anglicanism is said to have produced a quiet domestic piety, but it has not been without its heroic souls, and it would be interesting to trace them out. Wherever there is a soul truly ready to deny itself, and to take up the Cross and follow Christ, to offer its possessions, material, intellectual and spiritual, along with the Sacrifice of Christ, for the Glory of God and the salvation of souls, there the spirit of Reparation is awake and active.

V

Is it possible for us in any way to ease the sufferings of Jesus?

To answer that question we must have quite clear in our minds the cause and source of Christ's agony. The central fact of the Gospels is summed up in our Lord's own words: "The Son of Man . . . came to give His life a ransom for

many." He is God's Perfect Sacrifice, gathering up in His complete Act all that was true in the universal offering of sacrifices in all the religions of mankind. To that end He is God's Victim from Eternity, "The Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." All through His earthly life He shows forth the same office. From the moment of Incarnation His life is one of perpetual renunciation. He is God's Victim to Eternity. His Sacrifice, reaching its climax on Calvary, perpetuates itself in the Eucharistic Sacrifice. It will come to its consummation in Heaven. There, in the very centre of the Throne of God, St. John sees "a Lamb as it had been slain."

Now we, with our humanistic turn of mind, need to keep reminding ourselves that the most important aspect of Sacrifice is its Godward Intention. It has been defined as the "Act by which man acknowledges God's supreme dominion." From this point of view it has three aspects; it is latreutic, eucharistic and impetratory—*i.e.*, it consists of Adoration, Thanksgiving and Supplication. The dominating principle consists, not in making gifts to God (for we only have what He has given us, or rather lent us), but in the recognition of His Absolute Sovereignty.

Since the Fall of Man a fourth note is essential in all sacrifice. It must be penitential—*i.e.*, it must offer satisfaction, expiation for sin.

Referring once more to the natural basis, we know that, whether as children or grown men and women, the most helpful thing we can do to assuage the pain of one we love is to share it. Think of the real meaning of the words sympathy and compassion. Therefore, if we would offer real Reparation to our Divine Lord, an offering which eases His pain, it would appear that we can only do so by sharing His Passion, by becoming, as members of His mystical Body, Victims of Love. Our lives must, in short, be sacrificial. The thing which we can be sure gladdens His Heart is our setting out to become, by God's Grace, like Him. That, if it is to be anything more than sentimental gush, means to act like Him, to live like Him. That must mean to tread the path of sacrifice.

We have seen in what sacrifice consists. We come to this practical conclusion: Reparation will mean, first of all, that, associating ourselves deliberately in our self-surrender with the Passion of Christ, we will seek the Grace of God to enable us, or, better, to produce in us, lives of Adoration, Thanksgiving Supplication and Penitence. To do this is to give Jesus what rejoices His Heart. That is the simplest form of Reparation.

Go back once more to the elementary human basis. When a child falls and hurts itself, or suffers from without, we seek to

repair its hurt by giving it something it likes—a sweet, a story, a treat of some kind. We do exactly the same thing with an older friend or acquaintance. There is a deeper Christianity than we might suppose in the man who says, "Poor old So-and-So, he has gone through a bad time lately. I know he likes the Pictures. I think I will take him to a show; it will perhaps take his mind off things."

Dare I take that as an illustration? I dare so long as I bear in mind that it is an illustration of principle and not of detail. That our Lord rejoiced in the simplest attempts to give Him pleasure is proved, I think, by His prompt acceptance of the invitation to the wedding at Cana, and to Levi's dinner-party. Also by His stern rebuke of those who girded at the woman who broke the box of precious ointment, and, in the one act of generosity which was possible to her, poured the contents on His Head.

If we may pause for a moment over that incident, I would like to point out another comforting lesson it gives us. You will remember that Christ, in defence of her action, said words which neither she nor the Apostles understood: "In that she poured the ointment on my body, she did it for my burial" (Matt. xxvi. 7). Her act was so simple. A spontaneous expression of affection and penitence, open, as she soon found, to all kinds of criticism from the good and prudent men who stood around. Yet Jesus assures her, and all the world, that, little as she was aware of it, that act was inspired by the Holy Ghost, and gave to Him an essential detail of His Passion which would not have been supplied otherwise. We may surely find in that fact an assurance that the tiny acts of Reparation which are all that is possible to many of us are equally welcome to His loving Heart, and may indeed form part of His Sacrifice.

We have reached this conclusion then. The four forms of sacrifice to which we referred above are things which rejoice the Heart of Jesus. So if we are to offer Reparation pleasing to Him we must live lives of Adoration.

That is the true end of all religion. If we are guided at all by Holy Scripture we know that in its teaching we are brought from Creation and the Fall, through all the weary wilderness of instruction, discipline and struggle, through the Re-creation and Redemption of the Eternal Word, through supernatural incorporation with Him by the operation of the Holy Ghost, through death and resurrection, to that state or condition or activity in which we shall see God face to face, and know even as we are known. The highest state any saint has reached on earth is that of a union with God, which is more real than anything else, yet which such souls feel is only a foretaste of

what is to come, and which they can only describe in terms of Adoration.

To this end our lives must be lives of Thanksgiving. How our Lord welcomed that grace, and how sad its opposite made Him. "Were there not ten cleansed? Where are the nine?"

No doubt we often impress upon those whom we teach the duty of giving thanks, counting our blessings, etc., but if we would make our lives reparatory, then our whole existence must be a sacrifice of thanksgiving. The man of the world cannot understand how such a life of complete abnegation as, say, that of St. Francis of Assisi could also be a life more full of joy than any other kind of lives we know or have heard of. The secret is simple; the lives of the saints have been surrendered as thank-offerings.

We shall never learn Adoration without learning to be thankful, and we shall never learn either without making our lives a sacrifice of supplication. A soul can only find God for itself along the path of prayer. Prayer which is not merely making use of God, but prayer in the full deep sense which it has in Holy Scripture, in the Life of our Divine Master, and in the age-long tradition of Christian devotion. I dare not begin to comment on the life of prayer; let us sum up sacrificial prayer in the phrase of Brother Lawrence, "The practice of the Presence of God," and leave it at that.

Finally, we cannot begin to tread the path of prayer, thanksgiving, or adoration save as penitents. "Repent ye, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand." It is the only door to the realm where God reigns. Humility means the recognition that I am nothing and God is everything, Penitence means the further recognition that I am worse than nothing, for the very life God has lent me has been deliberately twisted by me to my own selfish ends, ends other, and opposed to, those of the Lender. Is not that what we ultimately mean by Sin? Here then, briefly and inadequately put, is the background, what St. Ignatius might call the Remote Preparation for a life of Reparation.

VI

How shall we try to work out such devotion to our Crucified Lord? May I quote from a pamphlet by the Vicar of All Saints', Margate: "We shall seek, in co-operation with the Holy Spirit, to grow in personal holiness by way of love. Love has many avenues of expression; Reparation requires them all. Our actions will be offered to God, in union with the Sacred Heart of Jesus, that they may be begun, continued and ended in His Will. Our self-denial and self-discipline (without which

there can be no true love) will be for the more complete conforming of our wills to His. Our sufferings of body and mind and spirit make an offering very dear to the Lord who endured for us His Sacred Passion. Our prayers and sacramental union give the greatest joy to Him, for thereby He can hold with us the most loving and intimate communion" (*The Order of Reparation*).

We shall plan a Rule of Life which will enable us to grow in the knowledge of Sin as it appears in God's sight, as it displays itself to us in the Cross of Calvary. Which will include the offering of all sufferings, however dull and unromantic, in union with the sufferings of the Redeemer for the making amends for human sin, including, of course, our own. This will mean some acts of self-discipline and self-sacrifice specially offered with this Intention. Our Rule will also make our sacramental life an offering of the union He gives in it for His Glory, and for any purpose He may desire in His strife against Sin.

It must also be framed to help us to aim at continual recollectedness, and to learn self-control by silence, hiddenness, and hardness of life. It will include, too, the offering to God of every daily duty, and the doing of it faithfully for love of Him, and for no lower object.

VII

I would conclude with a remark on what I believe to be some of the blessings with which God crowns a life of Reparation.

(a) It glorifies God. All willing sacrifice does so, and the fact that Reparation is inward and hidden means that the glory is God's alone. If you are trying to enter into the mind of God in His work of Redemption, to see Sin as He sees it, and to share in His atoning Sacrifice, your life will be set Godward.

(b) It keeps the soul on the supernatural level. So much modern religion is humanistic. It has its gaze on man and upon earthly things, however good. To be seeking to make Reparation means that we must have our eyes uplifted, looking at the Personal Christ, whose activity against Sin we are seeking to share.

(c) It utilizes life's wastage. To some of us the lethal ideas which are bandied about today in the most casual way are amazing. That G. B. Shaw should advocate the murder of people who seem useless is not perhaps surprising. But there is a great deal of talk, particularly among young people, about eliminating the unfit, apparently without any thought of what it entails.

Apart from this, which of you has not, in the course of your

ministry, come across some active soul, stricken with sickness and infirmity, maybe with suffering, who has felt that the hardest thing to bear in the whole business is the seeming uselessness of it all, and the vacuity of its own life? It alters the whole spiritual outlook if we can teach life's sufferers that the very thing which seems to have debarred them from taking any active part in the forwarding of the Kingdom of God can be the instrument of sharing in the Redemptive activity of the world's Saviour. The pain can be added to His pain, the inability to do things can be added to His Sin-bearing stillness on the Cross, the loneliness can be added to His loneliness in Gethsemane, the seeming futility to His seeming futility on Calvary, and all can be used of God as renewing and revivifying power. To be able to say to the sick man, the man with overwhelming mental stress, the man so poor he can give nothing, and so on, "Make your burden an offering. It is a treasure which you can use for the Divine Glory and the salvation of souls," is to bring to such a gospel which gladdens their hearts.

So, finally, we reach that strange paradox, of which Christian faith and life is full: that which seems to destroy life really enriches it. "He that loseth his life for My sake shall find it." To take upon ourselves deliberately the life of suffering seems the very negation of all joy, yet its greatest exponents have found it the actual fount and source of a joy which passes understanding. What is the key to that seeming contradiction? Reparation springs from love, and love is only near to happiness when it is giving to, or working for, or bearing on behalf of the beloved. In the denial of self we are removing the source of all our miseries and worries. In taking up the Cross and following the Master God has given to us the royal road by which our love to Him may be expressed and grow; and in love growing and expressed there is a joy which nothing can take away.

To the natural man, and, alas! to far too many who call themselves Christians, the source of joy lies in the possession of the good things of this life. Health of body and mind, goods and gear, money to command the services and indulgences which the modern world can so richly supply. Such joy always hangs by a very thin thread. It can be destroyed from so many different directions. On the other hand, you cannot touch the joy of a soul which simply takes every incident or circumstance which the world counts as sorrowful, and embraces them as treasures to be given to her God. They are the "matter" of her sacrifice, pleasing to God because offered in and with the perfect sacrifice of His dear Son.

I have barely referred to the more advanced forms of Reparation. There are souls who are called of God to lives of the most

stringent asceticism, with deliberately chosen and self-inflicted discipline. I have not dwelt upon it because it is, according to all the masters of the spiritual life, a special Vocation (like a Vocation to the priesthood, or to the Religious life) to be carefully tested, and only undertaken with the guidance of an experienced spiritual director. I have only spoken, and that most inadequately, of the call to ordinary Christians to offer Reparation, the call which is included in our Lord's, "If any man will come after Me," etc.

May I conclude with two other quotations:

"When our Lord Jesus Christ was a little babe there came those wise men from the East with their gifts; such strange and awful gifts. The gold of the world's work—and the little hands were stretched out to take it. The incense of the world's prayers. Then there came that last strange and mysterious gift, the world's sufferings, and the little hands have taken that too. They received the homage of the work and prayer of the world, and did they turn away from the world's suffering? No. The world's suffering is one of the greatest things we have to offer to God. The passive vocation goes hand in hand with the active and the contemplative in working out God's Purpose for the world."

"Measure thy life by loss instead of gain,
Not by the wine drunk, but the wine poured forth,
For love's strength standeth in love's sacrifice,
And whoso suffers most has most to give."

N. K. LEACH.

AN INDIAN VISITOR IN THE HOLY LAND

IF someone in Europe or America, who has already studied the *Bhagavad Gita*, should come to India, eager to understand it aright and to gain an insight into its deeper thoughts, we would ask him not merely to see the places mentioned in the *Gita* or the customs illustrating the framework of narrative into which its teaching is set, nor merely to study the contours of mountains and valleys, plains and rivers, the distribution of cities and villages, the nature of soils, the character of rain and dew and frost and sun, the changing aspects of earth and sky—in brief, all the natural facts which are likely to have influenced its thought—but we would urge him to meet the men and women of India with a view to understand how far its teachings have

penetrated into their hearts. The manner in which generations of devout souls have understood the ideas of the *Gita* and have interpreted them, directly as well as indirectly, in thought and life, emphasizing some and neglecting others, would serve him as a valuable commentary. Like all commentaries, it would have its dark passages and useless accretions, but in the main it would serve to make clear some at least of the teaching of the *Gita*. The study of men and women and of the ideals which inspire them would lead him to their teachers, the scholars and interpreters who make it their life-long duty to understand the text by collating its numerous recensions and by sifting its different interpretations. But whose are these interpretations? Are they not often the work of seers, akin in a measure to the seers who wrote the *Gita* itself? In India, as in any other country, it may not be quite easy to meet such seers. Scholars, pandits, are common enough. But men of profound insight, pondering with prayer and meditation on the hidden, because deep, thoughts of the *Gita*, transforming in hours of sometimes painful, often joyous, solitude its words into the living tissue of their souls, are not everywhere. But the quest for the inner meaning of the *Gita* is not complete until the student sits at the feet of such seers and receives of their benediction.

During my stay of two months in Palestine I sought to bear such principles in mind. I sought to see the sacred sites, to observe the customs of the country which confirm and illustrate the narratives of the Bible, to understand the influence of climate and geography on its culture, and particularly to see what ideas of the Bible have soaked into the life of the people and how they interpret them to day in throbbing thought and living ideal. While in Jerusalem, I read *Daniel Deronda* and was strongly attracted by the figure of Mordecai. With wonderful skill George Eliot pictures his sense of the destiny of Israel and his eagerness to pass on his enthusiasm to a younger man, in whom he himself would, so to speak, rise into newness of life. Are there any in the Jerusalem of today who belong to this type, men of the prophetic spirit and temper, to see whom would be to understand better the great Hebrew prophets? In such a short time it is no doubt hard to come to know such men, even if they live now, though I came across one who, aware of the glory of Israel and of his own share in it, was disciplining himself, body and soul, making himself ready for the hour when his destiny would be fulfilled. Eating little and that the Passover Bread, kept in store from the days of the Passover, working part time in an office to earn just enough to maintain himself and spending the rest of the day at the Wailing Wall, or at home

in prayer and meditation and in prolonged and earnest study of the prophecies, his wife nobly supporting herself and her son, he possesses, in a small measure, the fire of the Hebrew spiritual genius. Acquaintance with him brought home vividly to me the fact that just as towering peaks do not rise abruptly from the ground but from low-lying ranges, so the men whose writings have come down to us in the Bible are perhaps but a few lofty, towering souls standing out from among thousands in whom the same qualities dwelt, though feebly, and who in a sense made possible the commanding height of those we know but who have themselves now passed into oblivion.

This essay is a record not merely of the things I saw or heard but also of the ideas which these suggested to me, sometimes on the spot and sometimes in the course of later reflection.

Again and again I asked myself: Why am I in Palestine? A visit to Palestine is no longer a pilgrimage, an act of merit added by a generous heaven to the credit of the pious. But then Palestine, it may be urged, is "HOLY LAND." In a sense is not every land a "HOLY LAND"—wherever God speaks to men, wherever devout souls moved by a sense of His abiding presence are filled with joy? But in a special sense God revealed Himself in Palestine. He chose a People and made His will manifest to them and through them to the nations of the world. His varied dealings with them are recorded in a great Book and that Book is His Revelation. In a Temple, around which the story of the nation and its song and prayer gathered with fervour, was He specially present. Through Nature, through the cedars of Lebanon and the hills of Zion, through the sheep that feed on its meagre pasture and the stars that shine on its firmament, did He make Himself visible to the sons of men. Not only through these, but through a Person, to outward appearance a man like other men, but really the Divine Spirit, did He come to dwell among men. Thus in all these ways, external to the soul, through a People, through a Book, through a Temple, through Nature, through a Person, God held intercourse with men. But, besides these, He also directly and immediately speaks with men today.

My experiences and reflections in Palestine seem to weave themselves together naturally around this central theme—God's revelation of Himself to man. In Palestine, more than anywhere else, we often ask: How does God reveal Himself to men? Through a People, through a Book, through a Temple, through Nature, through a Person, or directly, immediately, soul to soul? In Palestine we realize vividly how different religions and peoples understand—or misunderstand—these

differing, though often converging, ways of Revelation, where they pass through regions of light and colour and where they wind through dark labyrinths.

I

THE CHOSEN PEOPLE

The Hebrew experience of God was—and still continues to be—largely collective. The choice of the Eternal rests not upon a man but upon a nation. No service is possible in a synagogue without at least ten men of over thirty years of age. We visited an old synagogue in Hebron and heard a legend about it. Once nine men came to the synagogue eager to worship. Being only nine, they could not have a service. But a stranger appeared and the service was held. People wondered who he was—he seemed so much like Abraham. Most of the prayers in the Prayer Book are concerned with national and not merely individual welfare. The City of Jerusalem takes on a new meaning when it is realized that for centuries during the exile and again during the many generations that have passed after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus in 70 A.D. the dream of her psalmists and seers has been that in Jerusalem God would meet them as a people. Even the Zionist movement is, in a measure, the urge of the Hebrew soul's longing for a collective experience of God. Like nationalisms the world over, Jewish nationalism is inspired by many—and sometimes not noble—motives, and there may be those to whom the settlement in Palestine means nothing more than a comfortable home, free from social persecution, in the land of their forefathers. But it would be wrong to ignore the deeper strata in the movement, to neglect the long-cherished conviction that the Lord would speak to the nation as a whole and that a scattered Israel could not inherit the promise in the same sense in which a unified Israel could. Israel scattered is no longer Israel. God might indeed speak to the individual Israelite, but that intimate intercourse that existed between God and Israel in the days of the Old Testament whereby the voice of the Lord was translated and embodied in national action and speech would no longer be possible.

Herein is the value of a Revelation that writes itself out in a nation's history. From some of the numerous hills around Jerusalem one has but a limited view, whereas from others in the same neighbourhood vistas beyond vistas of beauty are discernible, the eye ranging over immense distances. This is a parable. An individual experience of God is deep but limited, almost confined to the utterances of the still small

voice within. But the Hebrew idea of a God who reveals Himself in the massive movements of nations, in the panoply of armed force, in the din and rush of battle, even in the stir and clamour of politics, is a large and profound conception. Tennyson thought that if he could understand a flower in the crannied wall and all the wonder and mystery wrapped up in its little life, he could gain an insight into God Himself. The Hebrew prophets replace the tiny flower with its depths of mystery by a living nation, in whose fortunes, with all their baffling significance, God writes His will out.

In Palestine we realize how this view, which in a way broadens our ideas of God, does not at the same time narrow it. To say that God reveals Himself in History is a large view, at once wide and refreshing, but to say that God reveals Himself in the History of a single nation is neither wide nor refreshing. But that single nation, however much it may pride itself on its destiny, does not, in fact cannot, sweep along with proud exclusiveness. It is more like a star among a constellation of stars. Deep down in their being they are bound with other nations and peoples by numerous ties of language and kinship. Like me, a visitor might go to the Holy Land with the expectation that he would find customs and hear folklore illustrating the Bible from the descendants of the people who wrote the Bible—viz., the Jews—but he realizes with joy the conviction that such he finds not only among the Jews, but also among the Bedouins. The Bedouins are wandering Arabs, Moslems in name if not in fact. We may feel surprised if we realize for the first time that much light is shed on the Bible by the thoughts and practices of Moslems. Abraham must have been a kind of Bedouin wandering about with his herd of cattle and living in black tents woven from goats' hair. The instances of hospitality, the laws of revenge and justice in the Bible, find their best counterpart in Bedouin practice today. The meaning of the statement that God hid the sepulchre of Moses is best understood by the present-day opposition of Wahabis to tombs and everything else that would sanction or in any way make possible the worship of saints. In revealing himself to a nation, God thus, because of the many ties which bind that nation with other nations, reveals Himself to other nations as well.

II

THE BIBLE

The Jews have been called "the people of the Book." That is very true. As a prayer has it: "With everlasting love Thou hast loved the house of Israel, Thy people; a Law and command-

ments, statutes and judgments, hast Thou taught us. Therefore, O Lord our God, when we lie down and when we rise up we will meditate on Thy statutes; yea, we will rejoice in the words of Thy Law and in Thy commandments for ever; for they are our life and the length of our days."

I visited three synagogues and was struck by the enormous importance still attached to the Law in Judaism. The place of honour in the synagogue is the Ark where the scrolls of the Law are kept. There are many scrolls, as it is an act of piety to present the synagogue with a scroll. Before a scroll is taken out, those members of the congregation who are the descendants of Aaron stand on the platform in front of the ark with a loose mantle veiling their faces and engaged in prayer. During these solemn moments the rest of the congregation stand round, their eyes not allowed to gaze on the veiled figures. After the benediction, the Torah or the Law being "the Five Books of Moses" is taken out and every member of the congregation crowds around it to kiss it. Then as each section of the Torah is read a member of the congregation is summoned near the Reader's desk to listen to it. This summons is a matter of great honour and is much coveted. Those members of the congregation to whom anything special has happened in the week—the birth of a son, the death of a near relation, return from a long voyage—inform the Rabbi of the fact and are chosen for the honour. In the course of the week they make a contribution to the synagogue. Both before and after the section is read the man summoned engages in public prayer. After the appointed lessons are read the Torah is returned to the Ark, amidst the same impressive ceremonies.

I saw a different scene in another synagogue which I visited. In a large room, almost underground, several boys sat on benches with Hebrew Psalm books in their hands chanting the Psalms loudly. A teacher, with a menacing whip in his hand, explained to us that on the Sabbath the boys had nothing to do and the parents had asked him to take charge of them to keep them from mischief. They spent the whole morning there chanting the Psalms. As soon as we entered the room the boys gave up the chanting. A boy with drinking-water was much in demand.

A devout Jew explained to me his method of devotions. He woke up at midnight and had a bath. Then, clothed in blue—blue, like the blue sky, signifying the glory that rested on Israel—he chanted some carefully chosen Psalms till midday. Now, when he has not much leisure, he divides the Psalms into seven sections and takes a section each day, thus going through the Psalms completely once every week. The Psalms are his prayers.

All his aspirations and longings, both on behalf of himself and on behalf of his people, find adequate expression in the Psalms. Apart from the Psalms, he does not seem to need the prayer, vocal or silent, that ascends up on high in the form of petition for needs that arise from moment to moment, nor the prayer too deep for articulate expression that simply seeks the presence of the Eternal. The bed of the river has been cut once and for ever and the water must always flow along it. Even a river may change its course, but not the soul. Its prayers and longings must follow the channel that was once dug by the Psalmists.

This raises rather important questions as to whether new needs may not arise and demand expression and whether old truths may not really stay old truths and cease to need reiteration, because they are old and because they are truths. Old things may have to be thrown away, but not old truths. Because old truths need not and should not be thrown away, therefore we need not keep on repeating them for ever. Truths which are eternally true and which, as far as men are concerned, have become old—that is, have been realized as true for long stretches of time—may be assumed as true, assumed as wrought into the souls of men and therefore not needing explicit and verbal formulation. The frequent Jewish repetition of the Shema or the formula which declares the unity of the godhead makes this question important. To this day, the Jew repeats every day—morning, late afternoon and night, and several times on Sabbath days and Festivals in the public services—the words, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord is our God, the Lord is one." A modern Jewish Rabbi speaks thus of the Shema: "'Hear, O Israel, the Lord is our God, the Lord is one.' That is at once the quintessential embodiment of all our philosophy, as well as chief among Israel's contributions to the everlasting truths of religion. The first prayer of innocent child-lips, the last confession of the dying, the Shema has been the watchword and the rallying-cry of a hundred generations in Israel. By it were they welded into one Brotherhood to do the will of their Father who is in heaven. The reading of the Shema has—in rabbinic phrase—clothed Israel with invincible lion-strength, and endowed him with the double-edged sword of the spirit against the unutterable terrors of his long night of exile."

Surely Israel's great contribution to human thought is its insistence upon the One God. But have we not learnt the lesson already? Has not its meaning sunk already into the souls of men? The daily repetition need not be a burden. We are not annoyed by the sun rising and setting every day, by the flowers and fruits appearing in their due season. We rather learn to look for new

glories on the horizon every morning and evening, to discern new values in each new harvest. Great truths likewise call for the observant eye and the meditative soul which sees depths of meaning unrevealed till now.

To us in India setting out on a fresh formulation of old truths, the Shema ought to serve as a beacon-light. In a Jewish soul, drawn by the power of Christ, I saw the conflict—still urgent, still unsolved—between the demand of the Shema for belief in one God and the demand of the Christians for belief in Christ also as God. Surely there cannot be two Gods. So this Jew argues, perhaps the unity between God and Christ is like the unity between husband and wife in their moments of most intimate love, or perhaps God is reflected in Christ as in a mirror, or Christ is God's right hand—*i.e.*, the means by which God achieves. These unsolved conflicts point out to us the strong necessity for an arduous quest for a Truth great enough to comprehend in itself the unity of the Godhead and the Godhead of Christ.

III

THE TEMPLE

The most moving thing in Jerusalem is the sight of the Jews at the Wailing Wall. A part of the western wall of the Temple is left, and there every Sabbath as well as on special days like the fast on the ninth of Ab, when the Temple was twice destroyed, the Jews gather together to mourn the destruction of the Temple. It is a motley crowd with tragedy written on face and garb. They are from all parts of the world—Hungarian Jews with their fur caps and long velvet gowns of blue, red and yellow, often faded and threadbare; Spanish Jews; Jews from Arabia and Persia with their fez caps; modern Jews from Europe and America in present-day Western clothes. The more pious Jews have their hair uncut, others throw over their head and shoulders, in token of reverence, a cream-coloured shawl with dark stripes and fringes. The men stand at one end, the women at the other. Most of them keep reading from Hebrew books—Psalms or Prophets. On the ninth of Ab they read the Lamentations of Jeremiah. Some of them weep, some kiss the massive stones still left of the Temple. Every now and then someone begins chanting, sometimes in a sweet melodious voice and sometimes in a loud vehement voice that has no special charm but succeeds in giving powerful expression to concentrated feeling, and the others join him. This has been going on for years and will still go on.

This moving scene raises many a thought. True, the grand

temples of Solomon and Herod are gone, but the God who answered the prayers in the Temple is not gone, and the Temple of Nature, with the eternal hills as its foundation, over-arched by the firmament with its wonderful blue, spacious beyond measure and surpassing in beauty any temple built with hands, is not gone. Why then do the Jews mourn as if God were not? It is quite probable that all of them are not there to mourn for the Temple. Some may be there from mere habit, as Christians often go to church. Others go there to pray, sure that there will be no distractions as at home. Yet others go there because they have pressing private griefs and think that they might find relief from on high if they express them there. Between Jerusalem and Bethlehem there is a place called Rachel's tomb, where the scene at the Wailing Wall is repeated on a small scale and where we realize how much of the weeping at the Wall may be due to absorbing private griefs. But the main reason leading the Jews to the Wailing Wall is no doubt sorrow for the loss of the Temple. As a Jew who visits the Wall daily told me, every Jew is commanded by the Lord to present himself at the Temple three times a year, and as the Temple no longer exists, he comes to this spot.

If God reveals himself in one spot more than in any other, the Mosque of Omar stands on such a spot, a fitting shrine for devotion. On the Temple area with its many sacred associations stands this mosque with its mighty dome, crowned by the crescent, the most commanding building in all Jerusalem, seen for many a mile. You can enter it only in hours not consecrated to prayer. The mosque is built around the rock upon which in the days of the Temple sacrifices were offered. The rock is enclosed by a low marble screen, and that again by a circle of massive pillars, each pillar being crowned by a rich gilded capital. On the pillars rest the arches and on the arches rests the dome, the inner surface of which is wrought with red and gold. Between these pillars is trellis work of gilded material. Then there is another circle of massive pillars still, where the decoration is still more varied. Not content with the decoration of pillar and arch, there run from pillar to pillar marble slabs richly wrought and cutting off the arches into segments. Thus the plan of the mosque is simple—two concentric circles of pillars around the rock, the mighty dome hovering over the rock, and a wall beyond the concentric circles in which many stained-glass windows are set, enclosing the whole. Gold and deep red and deep green are the tints that seem to have captured the fancy of these master builders. On arch and ceiling, on the inner surface of the dome, patterns of gold—stones, leaves, flowers—are wrought on a background of green or red. The ceiling is

cut up into many segments and each segment is differently decorated. True to the genius of Islam that sets itself against all image worship, there is no sculptured figure of man or animal, and in a corner a disfigured marble shews some figure that has been rudely torn off by angry hands resenting the least approach at idolatry. Many verses from the Koran are inscribed here and there in letters of gold or black. The floor is covered with costly carpets, mostly red, with designs of blue and green upon them, soft to the tread. Here is the spirit of prayer. If the artist's eye picked the right marble, of attractive hue and adequate proportion, and if the sculptor's hand chiselled it to take away its crude surface of protruding angle, and the architect's hand fitted it where its beauty would be best seen, then the millions of devout souls that have prayed in the mosque from generation to generation must have wrought still further on the marble, turning the marble from beautiful, marvellously finished stone into a veritable sacrament, cramming it with the spiritual energy which is invisible to the eye but which impinges upon the soul. Apparently there is a law of heredity among buildings as among men, the law which passes on genius with replenished vigour to succeeding generations. The Mosque of Omar stands as a not unworthy modern representative of a distinguished line of sacred edifices, which have sought and succeeded in providing an environment in which man and God might come together. In this house of prayer on sacred soil would a Jew care to pray, even if the Moslem allowed him such a precious privilege? The thought is blasphemy to Jew as well as Moslem, to the Jew wailing for the Temple in which God dwelt and to the Moslem who disdains the Jew whom he has defeated and whose sacred sites he proudly possesses today.

God reveals Himself in History. Then the destruction of the Temple may be regarded as a dispensation of God, putting an end to the accretion of ritual and lifeless ceremonial that had gathered itself around the Temple. This may be obvious to all but the Jews. They have never ceased to pray for the restoration of the Temple, and if they had the opportunity the Temple walls would rise today to the music of the Psalms. It is remarkable that a people who have sought to hear the voice of God in History have not heard this particular utterance. They will continue to cherish the desire for a rebuilt Temple, and when occasion arises may even begin to build the Temple—unless indeed an Isaiah rises and with penetrating insight and powerful voice utters the will of God which he hears in the Present to a people who pride themselves on listening to God as He spoke in the Past, but whom all the Past has not convinced of the voice that spoke through the Past.

It is significant to note here the attitude of our Lord towards the Temple. To one who stands on the hills in the bosom of which the village of Nazareth lies, this thought takes on a new urgency. Here among these beautiful hills was the quiet life of fellowship with the Father cultivated and perfected. The hills, the flowers along the wayside, the birds that flew by, the simple village scenes, formed the background on which this life of communion with the Father was worked out. But it looks as if such a life begun and nourished in such an environment had to reach its perfect development in the Temple and its vicinity. Nazareth really lies on the way to Jerusalem, as a matter of geography as well as in spirit. It would not do to dismiss the thought with the idea that Nazareth is to Jerusalem what youth is to mature age, and that just as youth must pass on into mature age, so the period of preparation in Nazareth must perforce lead to the ministry and death in Jerusalem. Nazareth is indeed like youth in its hills strong and pronounced and rugged in their character, in its dreamy solitudes where visions are born and dreams take shape, and in its wide vistas lost in dim glory. Just as truly is Jerusalem like mature age with its crowded interests and busy life, its obedience to the Past, its accumulated tradition, and its conventional ways informed by the common sense that calculates but does not dare. Jesus passed from Nazareth to Jerusalem not merely in the sense that youth must pass into age, but in the sense that a life of prayer begun in solitude must be perfected in the crowd. To Him the Temple was not something opposed to inner piety but something which corrected and supplemented inner piety. For this our authority is the Fourth Gospel. This, the most mystical of the Gospels, places the ministry of Jesus mainly in Jerusalem. No mere ecclesiastical bias leads the writer to this emphasis. He mentions many facts which a biassed writer would have found it natural and advantageous to suppress. Jesus commends Nathanael who prays under the fig tree. The cleansing of the Temple, an act which a mere love of ecclesiasticism would have found hard to understand, is placed at the beginning of the ministry, thus going against the Synoptists, who place it at the end. Again, here occurs the great utterance, "God is Spirit: and they that worship Him must worship in Spirit and truth" (John iv. 24). These facts modify considerably the notion that the Author was an ecclesiastically minded person. The same Jesus who loved solitude, who passed over the sea of Galilee to the other side for quiet, who agonized among the trees on the slope of the Mount of Olives, also loved the Temple and prayed in it with others. His ministry finds there its centre. He who took such an independent attitude with regard to the interpreta-

tion of the Law and the Sabbath could not be said to have prayed in the Temple simply because the Jews were in the habit of doing so. His attendance at the Temple must be as significant as His other acts, must mean that He puts His sanction on institutional religion as well as on the mystical religion that seeks God in the depths of a forest or cave.

While it is clear that our Lord accepted the Temple as a place where He held intercourse with His Father just as much as on the hills of Galilee or beyond the shores of the Lake of Tiberias, the attitude of John the Baptist to this matter is not so easy to define. A visit to the Jordan made me realize vividly the daring and originality of the Baptist. We may surmise that it was more than an accident that he chose the banks of the Jordan and not the precincts of the Temple as the scene of his ministry. Behold, the priests were clad in their gorgeous vestments, but he donned the camel's skin and kept it in its position by a leathern girdle. The personality of the Baptist was, of course, powerful and rugged, and so was his message, full of burning wrath at all unrighteousness and hypocrisy. Just as significant was the simple act he did to confirm the effect of his preaching. Summoning by the spell of his personality people from Jerusalem with its Temple and its elaborate cultus and from the villages of Judæa and Galilee, he taught them with irresistible power. We can imagine their feelings as they heard at first distant rumours of this strange and fiery prophet in the wilderness; as they travelled, often for several hours, through stretches of barren, wild, uninhabited country to see him; as they came under the power of his personality among the trees on the banks of the Jordan; and as they entered the water in token of their repentance. How simple, how refreshing, how significant the baptism must have seemed in contrast with the carefully ordained ritual of the Temple! The man convinced of sin and ready to take a new step in life himself—and not through a vicarious offering of a lamb—is baptized by John. To undergo the rite at the hands of such a unique man as John must have increased the significance already inherent in the act itself as well as in the environment in which the act was performed. To this must be added the effect of the fact that it was as yet no recognized rite, no acknowledged badge of membership in a Church. We do not know what exact significance John attached to his baptism—whether he regarded it as a symbol or as a regenerative act, itself purging the soul—but it is no exaggeration to suppose that one at least of the reasons underlying its choice was its simplicity, its contrast with the cultus. Such a supposition is quite in line with his personality. What would John say to the later history of Baptism, calling forth endless controversy

as to its real meaning and often formal and lifeless? The daring innovator has himself become the father of a type of ritualism. The simple act which his spiritual genius used has itself become a rite, a ceremony. The profound thing is not merely that John chose such a path and trod it. It is not unusual for prophets to arouse men by startling words or deeds. But the profound thing is that this was the method of the Forerunner, he who bore such a peculiar relation to the Christ. If John had been a mere prophet, we might have considered his method of work as remarkable and indicative of the strength of his personality, and stopped. But then, we cannot do so with John. We are forced to ask: If John is the precursor, has his message any special relation to the preaching as well as the practice of those who follow Christ?

IV

NATURE

As a Revealer, Nature is often stern and exacting. Like a jealous teacher, she chooses her disciples with great care, imposes upon them exacting disciplines, and teaches profound truths now by half-veiled symbolism and now by strange formula. To catch the melody of the stars is harder than to understand the significance of a Psalm: to read the apocalypse of budding flower or ripening fruit is harder even than to grasp the meaning of a mystic's visions. This perhaps explains why some have sought God more in a Book or in a Temple than in Nature, and why some others have equated Nature with God. Trees and flowers, birds and rivers, are all God. The visitor to Palestine, interested in problems of Mysticism, wonders what is in the natural surroundings of that country—her hills, her rivers, her trees—which accounts for the fact that Hebrew thought is so free from this tendency to equate God with Nature.

To follow this line of thought is not to say that every aspect of Hebrew thought can be accounted for in terms of the natural scenery of the Holy Land and its probable influence on the thinker's mind, nor to say that every aspect of Nature leaves its imprint on the thought of the nation. For instance, in visiting the Jordan valley, I realized that the wild and rugged country may account for the rugged figure of John the Baptist, strong, stern and fierce, like a hardy son of the desert, a Greek Christian, who took us on the Jordan in his boat for a while. It may also account for his burning words, which scathed his hearers in the same fierce way as the sun scorches and burns in the valley. But then, through the hot and wild depression runs the Jordan, cooling and refreshing beyond measure, and calls up on either

bank abundant green trees and plants which afford shade and pleasure in the zone of the burning sun. The desert might have made him a son of bronze, winging his words with cruel power. But the river with its cool and softening influences seems to have sped along without any visible effect on his life or work.

The social character of Hebrew thought may account partly for the absence of Nature-mysticism. The process by which a soul, moved by the awful splendour of the starry constellations on a quiet solemn night, loses itself in them, these constellations not so much pointing to a Soul beyond, but somehow themselves becoming that Soul, is an individual rather than a social process. Crowd-psychology may add to the vigour of a revival meeting but not to this type of experience. We have read or heard of groups of friends meeting with God in silence, or of *Bhaktas* feeling the rapture of the experience of God through prayer and song in common, but we have not heard of companies of men feeling themselves one with the God who is not merely all-pervasive, but who is the glorious dawn, who is the river heaving with enormous flood. In its lower reaches this type of experience is the sublimation of Animism. Animism believes that trees and rivers and hills are informed with spirits. But with the Nature-mystic all these spirits become one. The Old Testament scholarship of today acknowledges that Animism was rife in the land of Canaan and that it has left its marks on its thought, but it did not reach the development which may be described as Nature-mysticism. This, I may say, is not mere accident but Revelation. It was the guiding hand of God that warded off such a development.

In its higher reaches this type of experience is poetry transformed into religion. The vague, dim, chaotic yearning of the poet, when accompanied by a strong religious nature, becomes the stuff of Nature-mysticism. The poet looks for the beauty that is subtle and fine, oftentimes vague, confused. And that may lead to anything. Not so the seer. He too may be captivated by beauty, but it is the beauty that half hides, half reveals an inner significance. Like a bud which is even more lovely than a fully opened flower, simply because it reveals so strongly but a part of its real self, this beauty is doubly attractive to certain minds. The Hebrew is more seer than poet. Among the beautiful hills of Galilee I realized how much more of a seer than poet Jesus was. He does speak of the Western sky, but its red speaks to him of the coming rain. The flowers remind Him of the Father who clothes them with a beauty surpassing the glory of Solomon.

The seer has too vivid a sense of the details to lose himself in Nature or in Nature's God. Nature-mysticism steps in

when the details get blurred, the outlines become dim. That is why Nature-mysticism is not present in the Old Testament or in the New. It may be interesting to examine whether a painter can possibly reproduce on canvas the beauty that makes him feel one with "the cosmic consciousness." It has not enough detail, enough clearness, to be rendered on canvas. I found it very interesting to gaze at the carpenter shops of Palestine. For in one such our Lord must have spent the greater part of His time. I noted—rather an obvious fact—that while some carpenters were engaged in doing heavy work, others were carving delicate flowers or leaves. To what category did Jesus belong? When we think of Him as the carpenter, we think of Him as making ploughs and yokes. But it is not at all improbable that He was a carpenter with the artist's eye and hand, fashioning things of beauty. If so, His careful observation of Nature—of which we have so many evidences in the Gospels—would enable him to carve flowers, leaves and fruits, accurate, vivid and sufficiently varied. On the other hand, His trained eye and hand would confirm what was already present in Him, as a part of His equipment as a seer, His habit of noting the details, of remembering the outlines of things He saw. This would have made impossible the vague, indefinable poetic feeling that sometimes developed into the experience of the Nature-mystic.

There is, however, a feature of Palestinian scenery which may account, partly at least, for the absence of Nature-mysticism in the Bible. The hills, rivers and trees were not so grand, so awe-inspiring as those, for instance, in India. The hills are petty compared with the majestic Himalayas, the effect of whose cloud-capped, towering peaks is to impart to the beholder's mind a sense of grandeur and awe. The Jordan is the only river, the others being mere rills that swell with the rains. And even the Jordan, swift and impetuous as it is, in fact though not in appearance, boasts of no broad and vast expanse that strikes awe into the heart. The fig trees and olive trees of Palestine, abundant not only in their fruit, but prolific in the symbols and images which they furnished to Hebrew poets and thinkers, are small, by no means grand or magnificent. One of the Psalms makes us wonder what turn Hebrew thought would have taken if the land had been full of grand and awe-inspiring scenery. I have often found it difficult to understand Psalm xxix., which speaks with such enthusiasm of the "voice of the Lord." But if George Adam Smith is right in identifying the voice of the Lord with the east wind, the thought suggested here finds a confirmation. From descriptions of the east wind by people who have had experience of it, it is evident

that it is wild and strong, capable of working immense havoc. It arrests the mind by its unusual power and might. The Psalmist who falls under its power identifies it with the voice of the Lord. The wind ceases to be a natural phenomenon, a significant symbol pointing to higher things, but itself becomes a part of the Divine. This is already well on the road to Nature-mysticism.

While, of course, it is quite true that the land of Palestine and her hills and trees are not grand or awful, we cannot forget the fact that the sun with his magnificent floods of light and heat, the moon with her weird, soothing spell, the stars, myriad in number and awe-inspiring, shine over Palestine just as much as over other lands that have produced Nature-mystics. These—the sun, the moon, the millions of stars—are by no means petty or small. But the seers of the Bible, guided, shall we say, by God, resisted the temptation to lose themselves in their grandeur, while sufficiently alive to their beauty.

A. J. APPASAMY.

(Bishop's College, Calcutta.)

MISCELLANEA

CORRESPONDENCE

THE GOSPEL OF MODERNISM

DEAR MR. EDITOR,

As a regular subscriber to *THEOLOGY*, I have read the review of *The Gospel of Modernism* in the current number.

I am concerned, and I find that my opinion is shared by other well-known priests to whom I have shewn the review, by the attitude adopted by the reviewer towards Mr. Richardson and his book. A reader of the review would naturally and, as I think, rightly infer that in the opinion of the reviewer, if not of the Editor, a priest of the Church of England can definitely reject the doctrines of the Virgin Birth and the Empty Tomb, and minimize the distinction between Deity and Humanity without in any way prejudicing his position as an authorized interpreter of the Creeds which he is bound to believe and teach. There is nothing in the review which would correct such an impression, and that in spite of the fact that Dr. Barnes in his preface to Mr. Richardson's book confesses that he knows of no standard of orthodoxy by which it may be tested, and of the further fact, unknown no doubt to your reviewer, that Mr. Richardson has publicly claimed that, failing any intervention of authority to check him, he has a right to conclude that such teaching as his is legitimate in the Church of England.

Yours truly,

C. NEWELL LONG.

37, BRAITHWAITE ROAD,
SPARKBROOK,
BIRMINGHAM 11.

April 20, 1934.

Mr. Balmforth writes: "My personal sympathies are entirely with Canon Long, and I too cannot regard it as compatible with the ministry of the Church that a man should deny the doctrines of the Virgin Birth and the Empty Tomb. But I did not, and I do not, regard it as within my scope as the reviewer of a theological work to raise questions of heresy, or to divert attention to the conditions of a diocese in which these denials are permitted. That is the business of the authorities of the Church, not of a reviewer in a theological journal. The reviewer is only concerned with the book's merits as a contribution to theological thought."—H.B. See also Editorial Notes, pp. 301 ff.

NOTES

CHRISTIAN STEWARDSHIP*

THE Church Assembly Report bearing this title has been before the Church of England for more than two years and has been debated in the Assembly

* "The Report of the Commission of the Church Assembly on the Principles of Christian Giving." Press and Publications Board. Price 1s.

and elsewhere. But even at this late date it may be not inopportune to discuss it, since the problem is one of continuing importance and urgency.

I

We are all in the same boat, oppressed by financial problems and ready to welcome any suggestions for getting more money for our projects. That the Report received even such a welcome as it did must be due to this, for it is very much open to criticism. The following notes were written after repeated readings in the sincere hope of finding useful contributions.

1. Do sermon tags really help? "David refused to offer to God that which had cost him nothing, and David had not known the power of the divine love in the Incarnation" (p. 10). What did it "cost" an Oriental king, who could say "*L'état c'est moi*," to give 50 shekels of silver? By our standards it would have been more gracious to accept the offer of Araunah. And does it really help to be told that God gave His own Son, when one is considering whether to spend more on one's children or to increase charitable subscriptions? Perhaps it does; but we cannot resist the sense of unreality when we read that "it is quite possible for a good man whose heart is filled with the ideas of the Jewish Law, and whose whole upbringing has been in an environment saturated with the theory of the tenth, to approach so nearly the Gospel ideal as to excel others who profess to follow Christ's teaching" (p. 16). Where are these conscientious Judaizers in the average parish? Even a sprinkling of them would relieve us of financial worry.

2. The paragraphs which flatter youth are deplorable. "Only the highest principles . . . have any real chance" of appealing to the young men and women of today. "The claims of young men and women . . . are for a frank and fresh search for the springs of truth." Young people no longer tolerate the parochialism which wants to keep money in the parish. (Nor would older people tolerate it, if someone else would undertake the responsibility of raising the curate's stipend, paying the organist and vergers, and meeting a heavy bill for repairs, when all the time there is an overdraft at the bank.) The younger generation have read Jeans and Eddington and, reflecting on what they find there, have a mind above a narrow parochial outlook. (Perhaps the churchwarden has also read about the stars and failed to detect any light thrown by them on problems of Church finance.)

3. The distinction made between paying and giving—"a contribution to Church expenses is not in the strict sense almsgiving at all," it is to be reckoned as money spent on oneself (p. 15)—does not become true by dint of constant repetition. Two business men live next door to each other. One spends his Sunday motoring; the other is often tempted to do the same, but he thinks it his duty to go to Church and put half a crown into the bag. You had better not tell him that he is merely paying for services rendered; he will not take you seriously. We may suppose that motive is what counts in God's eyes, and the motive that urges a man to forgo the customary pleasure of his set and honour the Lord's day, contributing what he deems to be his share of the costs of the Church, is deeply religious. But, in any case, the contention will not bear examination. One Church has the Vicar's stipend secured by an endowment, another has to raise it from the congregation. One has to maintain costly

buildings such as mission rooms or schools, another has only a Church, which happens to be in good repair, to maintain. What can be done for outside objects varies with the conditions of each parish. One parish may be spending its two mites entirely on keeping its own flag flying. The suggested criterion of true giving, that it helps to set forth the glory of God in a district where you do not happen to live, and to which therefore you are responsible only in a very modified sense, will not stand examination.

4. The practical suggestions are disappointing. "The Church collection at the ordinary services—canvassing from house to house by members of the Parochial Church Councils, the use of the envelope systems . . . a system of guarantees in writing, and other devices . . . if the Budget System supported by such machinery is steadily pursued year after year in the parishes of this land, our successors will reap such a crop in the future as will surprise everyone" (p. 31). The Press and Publications Board might produce literature in large quantities (p. 5). Associations for almsgiving "are as requisite for the full realization of the Church's mission as are associations for prayer" (p. 28). Though all might subscribe to the last dictum.

II

There are a good many factors in the problem which do not appear in the Report.

1. The normal thing in Church history has been to contribute to the needs of your own local community. The "collection" which occupied so much of St. Paul's thoughts was exceptional. The "saints" at Jerusalem, in expectation of the end, had realized their capital assets and spent them as income. Jerusalem was economically a pilgrimage town, dependent on visitors, and as the breach between Church and synagogue became clearly defined the Christians' opportunities of earning a livelihood would diminish. There was a real need for outside help. But the emphasis laid by St. Paul on the collection is greater than this cause can justify. Jerusalem was the mother-Church, and in some sense its members probably felt that the duty of supporting it, as the Jews of the Dispersion supported the mother-city by paying the temple-tax, devolved on the Gentile Christians. Just because St. Paul was obliged to force the issue in regard to the obligation of the Law, he was all the more anxious to preserve the link between mother-Church and daughter-churches unbroken in other ways. Apart from this "collection," and the spontaneous gifts of grateful converts made to the founder-Apostle, we may suppose that the early Christians were content to attend to local needs, including hospitality to visitors from other churches. Is there any evidence of centralized or missionary finance in the second and following centuries? Certainly the parish churches of mediæval England were normally built by the parishioners. No one would dispute the obligation of supporting home and foreign Missions in the changed conditions of today, but it is worth reminding enthusiasts that the primary obligation of every Churchman is to the local church of which he is a member.

2. We all want more money for our favourite missions, but are we quite sure that God wants us to have our way? Money is power, and we delight in having it to spend. It may be God's will to keep us poor and struggling and always dependent on Him. Probably a small increase in voluntary contributions of Church people would be an unmixed blessing.

But could we be trusted to use a big increase? Had there been unlimited money available in the nineteenth century, perhaps Sir Gilbert Scott and his school would have rebuilt all the mediæval churches instead of only some, and we should have bemoaned our grandfathers' generosity. A big increase in gifts for "work among the poor" might prevent the development of genuine working class corporate life. So again, a great influx of money sent out to the mission field might result in the establishment of institutions too luxurious for the native church to maintain. There is no fear of getting too much money; these instances are given as possible examples of ways in which we may recognize God's wisdom in keeping us poor. The pages of that remarkable quarterly *World Dominion* are full of examples of unpaid evangelists without scrip or purse bringing in thousands of converts and founding self-supporting communities in lands where the old-established missions are with difficulty maintaining their existing institutions.

3. The Report happily avoids the once common description of the Church of England as "the richest Church in Christendom," but it might have said more about social changes. To a large extent money has passed from the class with inherited traditions of social responsibility to new classes with no roots in the ground, to whom such ideas are at present alien. The middle class family man, who used to be the backbone of our congregations, is now overwhelmed with financial cares. He has no sense of security and dare not part with his reserves. Young married people have to buy a house and, though outwardly they may look prosperous, have very heavy outgoings. Thanks to the increased expectation of life, both classes stand out of their parental inheritance far longer than in the nineteenth century. The free money, available for large donations, is now largely in the hands of people of seventy and upwards, who, with perhaps many years in front of them and with the caution of age, are loath to diminish their resources.

4. Another difficulty of our day is that families are no longer homogeneous. A mother, for example, may attend church, her husband having abandoned the habit and her young people going out with their friends on Sundays. The calls upon her housekeeping allowance are endless. Charitable subscriptions can be made only at the expense of social amenities with which she is willing to dispense, but which the rest of the family consider their due. The families which would be united in desiring to make real sacrifices for the Church are far less numerous than formerly.

III

We could all add to the heads of this diagnosis. It is more profitable to consider whether there are any reasons for more generous giving, not mentioned in the Report, which could be used in our propaganda. Clearly there are. Conditions have altered so rapidly in the last two or three years that much is now plain which was necessarily obscure when the Commission met. The tide has set in strongly in favour of spending rather than saving. It is recognized that the resources of civilization are sufficient, in the absence of war, to keep all from want, and that undue hoarding will defeat its own object. A public opinion has been created which ought to make the ideal of generous giving more acceptable to our people. Granted careful habits and a dislike of self-indulgence, how should they respond to the new ideas? The limits of profitable expenditure on

the small houses of today are soon reached. What is needed above all is the creation of a sentiment that what we have in common should be worthy, which would lead to the rebuilding of mean towns and to the preservation of natural beauty. We are still far from Cicero's boast: "Odit populus Romanus privatam luxuriam, publicam magnificentiam diligit." Economic science and national pride both point the same way, towards free spending on public objects. The Christian, while doing his part as a citizen, will naturally be as generous as his means permit towards the objects which he has most at heart.

Providentially, the theological emphasis of our time reinforces this appeal. We are back once more in surroundings which recall the eschatological background of the Gospels and necessarily affect our theological outlook. Saving for a Palestinian peasant could only take the form of accumulating clothes or coin, which were at the mercy of moths and thieves. In the nineteenth century a man could lay up treasure on earth, reasonably confident that money would breed money and that he could ensure a steadily increasing estate for himself and his family. In modern political and social conditions property is as vulnerable, or nearly so, as in ancient Palestine. We must not repine; it may be easier to be a Christian now for this very reason.

W. K. L. C.

LICENSING CONFESSORS: SOME FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS

DR. SPARROW SIMPSON has done the Church good service by calling attention to the Bishop of Ripon's action in regulating in his diocese the right to hear Confessions. The only Anglican tractate on the subject which I have ever seen is a paper read by the late Canon E. G. Wood to the Society of the Holy Trinity in Cambridge in 1872.* It is, needless to say, packed with erudition, and though some of his conclusions seem unconvincing, it is in the highest degree informative. The present situation seems to demand a reprint.

According to Canon Wood, the necessity for jurisdiction in the priest who is to hear Confessions does *not* depend on the decrees of the Council of Trent, but is part of the older canon law of the Western Church. It is based on the nature of the case. Absolution does not merely need jurisdiction for the sake of discipline, but it is in itself an act of jurisdiction. Therefore in this respect it differs from all other sacramental ministrations; inasmuch as apart from this condition Absolution is not only irregular but invalid. The fact that any priest may give Absolution to a dying penitent is not inconsistent with this: it only implies that every priest *has* jurisdiction in these circumstances. According to Canon Wood, the distinctive feature of the Tridentine legislation is that Confessors in addition to possessing jurisdiction must have the approval of the Bishop. (Thus the modern Latin canon law gives the Bishop authority to examine even a canon penitentiary or a *parochus* as to the sufficiency of his knowledge of moral theology.)† This, however, does not concern the English Church. Our reference is to pre-Reformation canon law as modified by subsequent enactments of the Church of England.

This law, based on the Fourth Lateran Council, was that Confession

* Brought to my notice and kindly lent to me by the Rev. N. B. Davis.

† C.I.C. 877, 2.

should be made *proprio sacerdoti*. This has been interpreted as referring only to the annual Confession prescribed by the Council: but Suarez insisted that it referred to all Confessions, and (once more according to Canon Wood) this was the almost universal interpretation.

The *proprius sacerdos* meant the Bishop, the *Parochus*, or any priest to whom either of them delegated his authority. The Bishop and the *Parochus* held ordinary jurisdiction—i.e., jurisdiction involved in their offices; the others held delegated jurisdiction. The former were only removable by judicial process, and their jurisdiction was equally irremovable: the latter had no security of tenure, and their jurisdiction was held at the pleasure of the delegator.

There was, however, this difference between the Bishop's jurisdiction and that of the *Parochus*: the former was exercised by Divine right, the latter rested on ecclesiastical law; and the Bishop could restrain the exercise of the inferior jurisdiction either by forbidding the *Parochus* to delegate it to So-and-so, or by forbidding the delegate to act.

So far two results seem to follow: (1) The *Parochus* has no authority to restrain his curates from hearing Confessions. To attempt to do so is to withstand the authority of the Bishop, whose delegates they are. But the Bishop has plenary authority either to limit their jurisdiction, or to restrain it altogether. (2) There is no limit to the Bishop's authority in restraining the power to delegate. He may even, presumably, if he wishes, give a general direction that no *Parochus* is to delegate jurisdiction without his approval. But perhaps such a general direction would only be effective if it were promulgated in the Diocesan Synod.

It should be noticed that in recent years many bishops have ordered that no priests may minister at all in their dioceses without permission. Apart from the necessity (if such there be) of synodical promulgation, it looks as though this regulation does deprive priests from other dioceses of the power to hear Confessions without episcopal permission in dioceses where this regulation is in force, and therefore "probably" (in the technical sense of probability) invalidates their Absolutions. On the other hand, it could be argued that the Bishop did not intend his regulation to have this effect, and that therefore the ordinary power of the *Parochus* to delegate his jurisdiction remains intact.

Moreover, even under the Tridentine system it is held that in cases of general error and of "positive and probable doubtfulness," the Church supplies jurisdiction.* There is therefore no need for scruples on the part of the penitent; but there is great need that bishops and confessors should have this matter cleared up between them.

But there is a further important point in regard to the pre-Reformation law. Certain persons had the right of choosing their own Confessors. Such were: (1) the secular clergy; (2) those who had only venial sins to confess; (3) any to whom the Bishop or the *Parochus* granted this right; (4) anyone whose *proprius sacerdos* refused to hear his confession. Those who had obtained such a right were at liberty to go to any priest (subject to the Bishop's power to restrain either him or them from doing so) on one sole condition: he must be *idoneus*. "Idoneity" implied three things: (1) *potentia*—i.e., he must be a priest, and also physically capable of hearing Confessions; (2) *bonitas*—i.e., he must be of upright life; (3) *scientia*—he must know what he is about, and how to do it. (This last point would, perhaps, exclude those curious cases, not unknown

* C.I.C. 209.

among ourselves, where the penitent has had to tell his temporary Confessor what to do.) But, once more, those were not cases in which Confessions were heard without jurisdiction. The canon law conferred jurisdiction *ad hoc* on any *idoneus sacerdos* through the mere fact that the penitent selected him.

Now, what has the post-Reformation English Church done in the matter? All depends on the meaning of the passage in the Book of Common Prayer referred to by Dr. Sparrow Simpson. In 1549 this read, "Let him come to me or to some other discreet and learned priest, taught in God's word." It was altered to the present form in 1552.

It appears, therefore, that under our present regulations all are at liberty (*in default of regulation by the Bishop*) to choose their own Confessors, and that the Confessors so chosen have *ipso facto* jurisdiction for the purpose. No delegation from the Bishop or the *Parochus* is required, still less any formal approbation from the Bishop.

But here also there is a condition. He must be "discreet and learned." The question therefore arises whether this only means formally *idoneus* in the pre-Reformation sense, or whether it implies something further. Canon Wood asserts that it implies something far stricter, and that our choice of Confessors is limited by this phrase to three classes: (1) those already possessing jurisdiction, ordinary or formally delegated; (2) members of religious orders; (3) graduates in theology. (Had the paper been read at a later date, the writer would no doubt have omitted the third class.) Most curiously a further limitation is added: Absolution is of doubtful validity, according to Canon Wood, if the priest has never made his own Confession. (The extraordinary character of this last restriction might seem to cast doubt on the soundness of the entire position here summarized: but the well-known occasional eccentricity of Canon Wood's judgment must not be allowed to detract from his equally famous knowledge and accuracy as a canonist.)

Even if we disregard this final limitation, the arguments in favour of the closely restrictive effect of the post-Reformation English phrase do not seem convincing. They amount to two points: (1) that the *Parochus* who reads the exhortation classes himself among the learned and discreet, and therefore this cannot be a mere vague complimentary phrase (yet the writer acknowledges that these are *not* technical terms of the canon law); (2) that the English ecclesiastical authorities would have been culpably careless if they had really thrown open so widely both the right to choose a Confessor and the range of Confessors who might be chosen. But must we not judge the law by what it says, not by what we think that the legislator ought to have meant?

But whether Canon Wood is right or wrong, the present position is rather serious. If he is right, many of the Absolutions now given are invalid. If he is wrong, we have still to decide the meaning of "learned and discreet." If it merely means *idoneus* in the canonical sense, a great many priests have at present a technical right to hear Confessions who had very much better not do so. If, on the other hand, it is a vague phrase meaning "well equipped for the purpose," it throws the whole matter into uncertainty, and moreover makes the penitent the judge of his prospective Confessor's discretion and learning.

However the matter stands, then, the position is unsatisfactory: and it does seem desirable that the Diocesan Bishops should take some action. But if so, what?

We have seen that they have almost unlimited power to restrain the right of hearing Confessions, and it seems that if they do so they invalidate any Absolutions given in defiance of their regulations, at all events if these are duly and synodically promulgated. It is, therefore, of the greatest importance that any regulations issued should be both definite and regular.

There are at least four different classes of priests to be considered.

1. *Parochi*. These have a clear canonical right to hear Confessions.

2. Licensed assistant curates and others holding a licence or permission to officiate. There seems to be no reason for interfering with their jurisdiction except in particular cases. If the Bishop has any reason to believe that they are hearing Confessions without being qualified to do so by discretion and learning (*i.e.*, knowledge of moral and ascetic theology and of the technique of the Confessional), he might well examine them and if necessary restrain their action. This applies to senior priests quite as much as to juniors. Cases are not unknown where the young assistant curate is better instructed in the matter than his seniors.

3. Priests who may desire to hear Confessions out of their own dioceses. In view of the fact that most Bishops refuse to allow such priests to officiate at all except under strict regulation, it ought to be made clear whether or no such regulation is intended to prevent them from hearing Confessions without reference to the Bishop.

4. Newly ordained priests. It seems urgently desirable that if they are to hear Confessions they should have satisfied the Bishop of their qualifications. They should surely be examined in moral and ascetic theology, and not allowed to hear Confessions until they have shewn sufficient knowledge of these matters. It would still, of course, be open to the Bishop to restrain them for some years, partly or altogether, on the ground of insufficient experience. But two points may here be noted: (1) it might be disastrous to forbid a priest to hear the Confessions of those whom he had himself brought to desire the sacraments, or those entrusted to him for preparation; (2) it is an error to suppose that boys' Confessions require less experience than those of other classes.

The character of the examination presents a difficulty. The only adequate modern Anglican work on the science and art of the Confessional is Canon Belton's *Manual for Confessors*, and far the best work for the purpose on ascetic theology (at least as important as morals) is Father Harton's *Elements of the Spiritual Life*.

It could not be expected that examining chaplains should insist on all candidates taking these particular books. But for those who do not propose to hear Confessions as part of their regular duty it would be easy to suggest alternatives. Jeremy Taylor's *Ductor Dubitantium* and *Holy Living* and Dr. Hardman's *The Christian Life* are obvious examples.

In conclusion, it seems to follow from our examination of the theory of jurisdiction that the idea that a Licence or Faculty is required for the hearing of Confessions is neither Catholic nor Anglican, but characteristically Roman. The Bishop has an undoubted right to restrain unsuitable Confessors, but insistence on Faculties can only be justified by an appeal to the Council of Trent.

KENNETH D. MACKENZIE.

SHEBNA "THE SCRIBE"

We should like to call attention to an interesting note by Professor S. H. Hooke in the current number of the Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund, which records the discovery of an inscribed seal at Tell Duweir.

The seal has upon it two names, Shebna and Ahab (לִשְׁבְנָא, *lshbn'*, to Shebna, אֲחָב, *'h'b*, Ahab). The script is of the Phœnician type—e.g., the Siloam Inscription, c. 700 B.C., and the Moabite Stone, c. 840 B.C. The place of its discovery, Tell Duweir, according to Dr. Garstang, "exactly suits the indications as to the position and importance of Lachish" (*Joshua Judges*, p. 392 and pp. 172-4; see also Mr. Starkey's Lecture, *P.E.F. Quarterly Statement*, 1933, p. 190). Hezekiah sent his embassy to Sennacherib at Lachish, and Shebna "the Scribe" may well have been one of the party. There seems, then, as Professor Hooke points out, to be the possibility of a link between our seal and Hezekiah's major-domo (see Isaiah xxii. 15, xxxii. 22, xxxvii. 2, and 2 Kings xviii. 37; xix. 2, Isaiah xxxvi. 3, 11 and 2 Kings xviii. 18, 26). R. D. MIDDLETON.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

THE April issue of the *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* opens with an account of the Ebionite Baptists by Father Thomas. As he endeavours to trace them from the first century onwards he is struck by the paucity of the evidence, though he plainly thinks that at first they were influenced by the Essenes. Instead of looking on Ebionism as a heresy he is rather inclined to regard it as a conglomeration of diverse elements badly put together. "Nous croyons pouvoir reprendre cette formule; nous parlerons d'ebionismes plutôt que de l'ebionisme." Father Gougoud publishes the journal of François Rio, who records his observations of literary London in 1839. This is the first instalment of what promises to be a record of great value. M. Rio not only met the literary lions but also such statesmen as Gladstone. Father Mollay publishes another journal bearing on the beginnings of the French occupation of Rome in 1849, an occupation of lasting importance. For the French occupation of Rome rendered possible the Vatican Council and the promulgation of the decree of the infallibility of the Pope. This occupation was the primary source of all the misfortunes of Napoleon III., who came to recognize it as the chief cause of his downfall.

R. H. MURRAY.

Zeitschrift für die A.T.liche Wissenschaft. 1933. Hef 3/4.

This double number contains articles by Zimmerli on the structure of Old Testament Wisdom books, which go back to the courts of Egypt and Babylonia; by Prof. Irwin of Chicago, on Job. viii.; and by Dr. Birkeland of Oslo, championing the unity of Psalm xxvii., against the usual view which separates 7-14 from 1-6. Prof. Schulz of Breslau gives reason for translating "pleasure garden" instead of "Garden of Eden." R. Tress concludes his very elaborate monograph on the Ordeal in ancient Israel, which has left traces on the diction of the Prophets and the Psalms. Prof. T. H. Robinson puts forward emendations of passages in Lamentations. Summaries of articles which have appeared in some 100 learned

periodicals of all lands, bearing on the Old Testament, Judaism, and Biblical Archæology, illustrate the seriousness of the problem of keeping up to date in these matters.

Of most general interest is the Editor's putting together from many sources of the data regarding the recently discovered synagogue at Dura (Europos), on the Euphrates, which was founded in 244 and destroyed by the Parthians in 256. The Biblical wall-pictures have striking affinities with early Christian representations of the same scenes, which agree in departing from the Bible narrative. The origins of Christian art need to be restudied in the light of this discovery. The Jewish community was evidently rich and powerful compared with the Christian. It was far from orthodox, though its organization was the usual one. Representations of heathen gods are found. The Apocalypses were familiar, but there is no trace of Messianic expectation, which had perhaps been superseded by belief in the resurrection of believers.

W. K. L. C.

Analecta Bollandiana. Tomus lii., Facs. i. et ii.

Nearly half the current number is taken up by an unusually lengthy and comprehensive *Bulletin Des Publications Hagiographiques*, a list so catholic that it includes *The Beginnings of Christianity, Part I.*; *The Acts of the Apostles*, edited by F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirksopp Lake, t. iv. and v.; and *Eusebius Pamphili, a Study of the Man and his Writings*, by F. J. Foakes-Jackson. Somehow one would not have looked for a review of these works under this particular heading.

The review of four recent works on the catacombs gives the results of recent archæological research, and is well worth reading. There is also an appreciative review of the *Descriptive Catalogue* of the Lambeth MSS. (M. R. James and C. Jenkins) and *The Catalogue of the Aberdeen University MSS.* (M. R. James). The review of *Sidonius Apollinaris and his Age* (C. E. Stevens) throws an interesting light on the Bollandist view of the motives for some early canonizations. "Sidonie est arrivé aux honneurs des autels comme tant d'autres évêques qui n'avaient laissé aucun fâcheux souvenir et dont l'anniversaire était inscrit sur la *Depositio Episcoporum*."

The number contains an interesting article, *Les Khazars Dans La Passion De St. Abo de Tiflis*, who was martyred on January 6, 786. By comparing what is known of the contemporary history of the Eastern Empire, the Mongols and the Saracens, the writer of the article shews how accurately the events of the Life fit in with this history.

The Life, it may be noted, is contemporary, and, one might almost say *therefore*, non-miraculous. It also shews, as indeed we learn elsewhere from the history of the Nestorians, and the travel narratives of later adventurers like Marco Polo, how little prejudiced the Mongols were against Christianity, and what an opportunity for the conversion of the dominant power in the Far East lay open for centuries. Only the Nestorians, however, entered this open door, and when their effort died away there was no one to carry on the torch, for the Franciscan missionary efforts were too spasmodic and too little supported to count for much.

A long article headed *Catalogus Codicum Hagiographicorum Bibliothecæ Civitatis Treverensis* is of interest and importance to any scholar who has occasion and opportunity to make use of it.

C. P. S. C.

REVIEWS

THE OXFORD HANDBOOK OF RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE. Issued by the Oxford Diocesan Council of Education. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d. Also a Special Edition for the use of Provided Schools. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

This handbook is for the use of teachers of children from eleven to fourteen years of age. It is always difficult to assess the value of a syllabus for religious instruction until it has been tried by use. Experience alone can shew how far the intention of the compilers is capable of realization. But we can say at once that no book of its kind that we have handled has created so much confidence at first reading. The title of the volume, "handbook," gives a preliminary hint as to the nature of its superiority over most previous syllabuses. Here we have a real *book* to put into the hands of teachers, and not merely a programme with (or sometimes without) references to sources of material wherewith to cover a mere skeleton. In this book teachers are not merely told what ground they are to cover, but are given ample and wise directions as to how they are to deal with it.

The book, which opens with commendatory notes from the Bishop of Oxford and Dr. Michael Sadler, first of all gives notes on books for the use of children and teachers. Rightly, a supply of Bibles and Prayer Books for the children's use is demanded. But the note on teachers' libraries strikes us as inadequate, and this is the one serious defect in the whole book. It is, of course, impossible and undesirable to give an exhaustive list, but considerably more might have been given. There is, for example, no reference to the recently published *Teachers' Commentary* (S.C.M.) or to the ample materials and illustrations published by the National Society. Similarly, to the list of wall maps should be added information about the indispensable wall pictures available and to models.

Of the lay-out of the syllabus it is impossible to speak too highly. Old Testament, New Testament, Prayer Book and Catechism are arranged on a three-year plan, with (except in the case of the Prayer Book) a fourth year which it is hoped may be used in secondary schools or for teachers of any children over fourteen years of age. The Old Testament is so arranged as to give a progressive study of the whole, with the period "between the Testaments" in the fourth year. Two admirable features of the Old Testament work are (i.) the correlation of the Old Testament with the New, the Old Testament being

always studied in the light of the New; and (ii.) the early narratives are postponed until their origin and significance can best be appreciated.

In the New Testament the Life of Our Lord occupies the first year; the expansion of the Church the second year; a subject study of the Gospels the third. In the Prayer Book there is something more than a mere drill in the text. Here we have a real training in the spirit of Prayer Book worship with the intention of giving insight into all those approaches of God to man and man to God which are expressed in the various services and occasions. Here too (as also in the Catechism section) the needs of the children's private prayer life are kept in view.

The Catechism section is much helped by the previous Prayer Book section, and each has evidently been planned with the other in view, as is right. Teachers can keep the two sets of lessons in step with each other because of their admirable arrangement.

The general summary lay-out of the whole syllabus is followed by an *in extenso* treatment of each section. The method here employed is to divide each section into lesson-subjects, each with a brief introduction and suggestions for actual lessons. The introductory notes are excellent and are accompanied by short comments on the text. The value of these notes to the teacher should be immense, but it might have been increased by references to books for further reading. There are also additional notes throughout the book on points of special difficulty or importance. All this annotation is accurately informed and represents a marvel of compression of sound scholarship. The doctrinal standpoint of the book is definite and faithful to the spirit of the best biblical and Prayer Book scholarship. The arrangement is clear, and the fulness avoids the "Bradshaw" feeling that most syllabuses create.

We note with regret the absence of English Church history from the scope of the book. It is, of course, impossible to cover this ground at all fully without sacrifice of other matter that is even more important, but we would suggest that in any future revision the beginnings of the English Church might be incorporated into the "Acts" section as a lesson-subject in continuation of the theme of the expansion of the Church. Overseas missions receive a definite though not very ample place in the syllabus.

There is a special edition of this book for use in provided schools, in which the sections on the Prayer Book and the Catechism are replaced by well-planned sections on the Lord's Prayer and the Apostles' Creed, and Christian duties.

Mr. E. R. Micklem testifies to the acceptability of the syllabus, in this form, to nonconformists.

We anticipate and hope for a wide use of this excellent handbook outside the diocese of Oxford as well as within it. As the compilers conjecture, it will prove to be of great value to teachers of adolescent and adult classes as well as to the schools for which it is primarily intended. Its value for Sunday School purposes is more doubtful; Sunday School teachers will find much valuable help in it, but the conditions and the aims of Sunday Schools are so different from those of the day schools that, as sets of lessons for Sunday School use, the component parts may not be suitable. Confirmation Schools and Fellowships, however, might well find the Prayer Book and Catechism sections of great value.

A. R. BROWNE-WILKINSON.

THE CONCEPTION OF GOD IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF AQUINAS.
By Robert Leet Patterson, Ph.D. George Allen and
Unwin, Ltd. 21s.

The object of this very competent book is to expound and criticize the teaching of St. Thomas on the existence of God, His attributes, and His relation to the created world. The exposition is based on a remarkably wide knowledge of St. Thomas, being drawn not only from the *Summa Theologica* and the *Summa contra Gentiles*, but on half a dozen other works besides; it is very thorough and careful, and the style rivals that of the great Doctor himself in its dryness and in its disdain of the homely illustrations which make philosophical argument intelligible to the simple-minded. Dr. Patterson accepts in principle St. Thomas' handling of the arguments for the existence of God; he criticizes, however, his distinction between the knowledge *that* God is and *what* He is, claiming that it is not possible to prove the existence of God without knowing "not only a good-deal but a very-great-deal about His nature." But his chief criticisms are concerned with the statement of God's relation to the created world. St. Thomas, he says, does not explain satisfactorily, on the one hand, how the First Cause can produce effects in the created world and still remain unchangeable; and, on the other hand, he states God's relation to the world in such a way as to endanger the real existence of the world. "If St. Thomas failed successfully to defend his position in regard to the nature and reality of relations, his doctrine of the Eternity of God will be hopelessly shattered, and the very foundation of his system will be destroyed"

(p. 223). And again: St. Thomas makes "an extremely significant admission, namely, that God could have created a better universe than that which actually exists"; and a God who, being able to create a better universe, created a worse one would be "quite as much an ontological tyrant as the Allah of the Koran" (p. 439, *cf.* p. 470).

Here we feel it our duty to make a protest. Dr. Patterson goes too far; he does what St. Thomas refuses to do, and assumes that man can pronounce a judgment on God's purpose in creating the universe. But what right has man to sit in judgment on the God who made him? Again, Dr. Patterson finds contradictions in St. Thomas' system. He may be justified in doing so; it is not possible to discuss these things adequately in a short review, and the mere *placet* or *non placet* of a reviewer would be worse than worthless. But what we are concerned to say is that no philosophical system can well be a replica of God's own truth, and that if there are contradictions in the investigation of a reality which is admitted to be "incomprehensible"—*i.e.*, greater than the human mind can grasp—it is at least possible that the contradictory propositions correspond to elements of truth.

We are not pleading for irrationalism, any more than in the moral sphere St. Paul pleads for immoralism ("let us do evil that good may come") when he denies that man can be justified by his own moral efforts. We mean that the two cases are parallel. As no one is morally right who takes pride in his own morals, so (we may dare to say) in the sphere of faith no one is really orthodox who is sure of his own complete orthodoxy, and in the sphere of philosophy no one is thinking rightly who is not aware of the limitations of his thought.

The philosophical theologian analyzes the conceptions of the finite and the infinite, the relations of the notion of created being to that of the Eternal; and here the value of the study of St. Thomas, as a philosophical discipline, is unequalled. But in this we are dealing throughout with notions of God, not with the reality of God; we are treating God as the object of our thought, and attempting to form a coherent conception of Him in relation to the world and ourselves. But the reality of God is shewn in what He does, as an active Subject, as the Master in His own house; He creates and sustains a world for His own purposes, and He redeems it. Can we then prove the existence of God? There is a disturbing quotation from M. Sertillanges on p. 363 (*cf.* p. 9), "perhaps the most pregnant comment ever made upon the philosophy of St. Thomas—that 'the proof of God is the task of the entire theodicy'"; *i.e.*, of the whole philosophical treatment of God's eternity, know-

ledge, power, etc. Can the existence of the Lord Jehovah be proved from the premisses of human reason? We may well admit the relative validity of the proofs of God's existence: the world as we know it is, in Prof. A. E. Taylor's phrase, "non-self-explanatory," and requires for its explanation a super-nature, a Being which is its own *raison d'être*. But to prove this is not to prove that "the Lord, He is God," but simply to state the relation of the notion of God to that of the created world.

Dr. Patterson and St. Thomas are both dealing throughout with the philosophical analysis of the notion of God, not with His real action. And here, perhaps, is the true explanation of the famous dictum of St. Thomas, shortly before his death: "I can do no more. Such secrets have been revealed to me that all that I have written now appears to me to be of little value" (*Catholic Encyc.*, vol xiv., p. 665). Dr. Patterson, like most commentators, interprets this (p. 491) of his mystical vision. But may not the true meaning be that he had seen precisely this point, namely the difference between human notions of God and God's own real action? He had believed that he had been writing about God Himself; actually he had been analyzing his own notions of Him. After this he wrote no more.

A. G. HEBERT, S.S.M.

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. Vol. I.: STANDARDS. Edited by Oscar Hardman, D.D. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

This notice must begin with an apology for its late appearance. But books generally make their impression soon after publication, and unless their impression is immediate and deep they tend to be overlooked afterwards. As it would be unfortunate if that were the fate of this volume, to call attention to it some time after its issue may not be entirely a disadvantage.

For it is an important work, very relevant to present conditions, and for the most part of that practical kind such as the clergy generally so often express their need. There is a serious challenge to Christian moral standards, no less real and dangerous because its extent and depth in our own country are hard to estimate. Things are often not as they appear to be. We can make some big mistakes by relying too much on people's (and particularly on young people's) conversation and on the books they read in arriving at our judgments about their real mind on questions of conduct. An element of the incalculable and of the adventurous is a real factor in vigorous life, and many satisfy their desire for it in their talk and reading.

Like Charles Lamb, they find pleasure and release in sometimes imagining a world and ways of life in which "meddling moral distinctions" are relaxed. My own not extensive though growing experience in discussions with groups of churchfolk is that relatively few of them are seriously perturbed about the basis and standards of Christian life. It might be better if they were. But there is a minority who are; and there is a vast company of those who are without or on the fringe of the Church who are. Further, hundreds of novels and films depict and seem to approve ways of life which are radically opposed to Christian standards, if indeed they have any settled standards at all; the power of this constant mass of suggestion is very great and its influence more insidious and effective than reasoned frontal attacks. To ignore the challenge is disastrous: to be unable to deal with its effects intelligently is a most serious handicap in priests and Christian teachers. The many intrinsic merits of this volume are heightened by the fact that it is a valuable contribution to a department of Christian theology in which our Church is still deficient. After a careful and critical reading of it, I think it is to be recommended warmly, and particularly to those whose difficult duty it is to uphold, expound, and defend Christian moral standards.

It is a composite book. The editor states and explains the modern challenge with insight and temperance. Indeed it is the excellence of his first contribution which suggests the only serious defect in this book, which is also a weakness of modern theology. Some of the most potent elements which, as Dr. Hardman points out, contribute fundamentally to the modern challenge, are those which suggest views of man's nature which are not treated in this book. Not a little in the scientific outlook, particularly in the form in which it communicates itself to those who are not specialists, is more immediately effective as undermining the Christian doctrine of man than the Christian doctrine of God. A naturalist or humanist view of man leads logically to a naturalist or humanist ethics; and both are radically inconsistent with Christian standards, which come to us from those who believed something very different about themselves from what the naturalist or humanist views of man allow. In a world in which, for good or ill, men are much concerned with their own nature and its demands, doctrines of man which seem only too closely to harmonize with their own experience are often effective in that they prevent men from ever coming really in sight of the Christian doctrine of God and its all-pervading influence on human conduct. In a book on the Christian life and its basic standards it must, I think, be accounted a defect that there is no exposi-

tion of the Christian conception of man and of the inadequacies and fallacies in other conceptions which are so determinative of practical conduct and so destructive of Christian moral standards.

Within the limits of a short review it is not possible to do the scantiest justice to or even to indicate the contents of each or any of the sections of this book, all of which have separate themes. Dr. Goudge, with his usual clarity and incisiveness, and with his extraordinary command of the contents of the New Testament, sets forth the distinctive character of the Christian way of life. Here there is, in general, the fullest recognition of the dependence of Christian moral life on Christian doctrine. The characteristics of the Christian life noted and treated are that it rests wholly upon grace, that it is unworldly (in a sense carefully distinguished and defined), and that it is made possible and is directed by the indwelling Spirit of God, and therefore is a life of progress and adventure. Some may feel that in one sense Dr. Goudge is inclined to draw the lines between the Church and the world a little too sharply. It is no doubt well to do so in the interests of clearly defining the doctrinal issues; but it remains that history and fact are not quite so tidy, and that the Church has often been influenced for good from sources which, if not wholly aloof from her own influence, are largely independent. Theory must allow for this fact.

Mr. A. E. Baker, writing on the formulation of the Christian ideal, covers in his first section part of the same ground as Dr. Goudge, but in a rather different way. Mr. Baker's is by far the longest section in the book; and if its immediate practical bearing is neither so obvious nor so clearly indicated as is the case with some other contributions, it is (if one may take leave to say so and without implying comparisons between sections of the book which are not strictly comparable) a very fine piece of work. In 110 pages he contrives to write an historical outline of Christian moral doctrine, with exposition of the work of leading figures down to the present day. It would be unfair to mention as a criticism that there is much more of value in modern contributions than would be suspected from Mr. Baker's summary, but perhaps some of the historical exposition could have been spared to make room for an estimate of these.

Delicate insight and wisdom are needed to treat usefully of Reverence, and they combine to make Mrs. A. D. Lindsay's essay as admirable as anything in the book. Modern interest therein may excuse particular mention of her references to contraception, though she is concerned with much else. Too

much of the earnest defence of what are regarded as Christian standards in this matter is marked by vehemence of assertion rather than by reasoning or by any apparent qualifications of the defenders to deal with the subject: it often does more to offer targets and ammunition to opponents than to convince the genuinely perplexed. Here is something of a deeper and more thoughtful character. Mrs. Lindsay's whole approach to this particular and difficult question determines her treatment of it. It should have a wide appeal, and ought to weigh with those who take a less rigid line. I have read nothing better.

Bishop Heywood, Canon Crum, the Rev. A. T. Cadoux (the well-known Congregationalist writer whose inclusion among the authors shews the possibility of co-operation in the defence of Christian moral standards, and whose work is eminently sane and acute), Prof. C. F. Rogers (particularly skilled in understanding popular difficulties and objections, and in dealing with them with a much greater knowledge than he allows to obtrude) and the editor expound respectively the Christian standards of Loyalty, Compassion, in Overcoming Evil with Good, in Honest Dealing, and in the Increase and Use of Wealth. All of these contain an abundance of comprehensive material which should prove of great use to the clergy for the preparation of whole courses of instructive and constructive teaching, such as would be of real help and guidance on practical matters, and of a kind and quality able to withstand ill-informed and hostile attack. Anyone who often reads papers and joins in discussions in rural deanery chapters and similar gatherings knows that the clergy need such assistance. Many of the questions which arise spontaneously out of their own practical experience are clearly formulated and answered in these 400 pages. The cost of the book is an investment which none would regret, and it is to be hoped that the help which the editor, his collaborators and S.P.C.K. here make available will be used. If it is, it will certainly be valued.

J. S. BEZZANT.

NOTICES

LITTLE SERMONS FOR THE CHRISTIAN YEAR. By L. B. Ashby, M.A. Skeffington. 3s. 6d.

GOD'S MESSAGE. By J. H. Stowell, D.D. Skeffington. 3s. 6d.

THE ONE FOUNDATION, AND OTHER SERMONS. By J. T. Inskip, D.D., Bishop of Barking. Skeffington. 6s.

ON SACRIFICE, AND OTHER SERMONS. By G. C. Fletcher M.A. Skeffington. 2s. 6d.

GOD AND THE WORLD THROUGH CHRISTIAN EYES. First Series. Edited by Leonard Hodgson, D.D. Student Christian Movement Press. 4s.

We are constantly told today that we are on the eve of a great religious revival. But one sign which has heralded every great religious awakening of the past remains conspicuous in its absence. There is no revival of preaching of the quality which will capture the attention of the man outside the Church. We do not believe that Mr. John Smith will return to his habit of churchgoing until he is provided with sermons which he appreciates. Mr. Ernest Churchman may comment sanctimoniously that Mr. Smith ought not to come to church just to hear a sermon, but to join in the Church's prayers and praise. This is hardly fair to Mr. Smith. He cannot be expected to take an intelligent part in Sunday worship, whether at Sung Mattins or at Sung Mass, unless he is given the necessary instruction as to the meaning and purpose of these services, which it is the part of the preacher to supply and to render attractive. And we believe that the failure of Anglican preachers to gain Mr. Smith's attention is due to their under-estimation of the extent of his intelligence, and their over-estimation of the extent of his vocabulary.

Mr. Smith is anxious for information and instruction, if it is presented in an interesting manner; but he is not content with the vain repetition of religious or moral *cliches*. Mr. Ashby's book certainly provides such instruction; but his sermons originally appeared in the columns of the *Morning Post*, and therefore stand at a disadvantage. The Churchgoer regards the Sunday sermon as his principal intellectual dish for the day; the reader of the *Morning Post* probably regards the religious column as an *hors d'œuvre* to be consumed on his daily Tube journey, before he gets down to the more solid fare which the Crossword and the Sporting columns provide. Somehow these sermons give the impression that the author knows he cannot hold his readers' attention long. He provides food for thought between Golders Green and Belsize Park; but hardly sufficient to last out the journey to Charing Cross. Dr. Stowell is bright, breezy and brotherly, and the illustrations which he draws from the records of the first half of the Old Testament shew considerable psychological insight. But Mr. Smith at the present time wants to know something of the credentials of the Old Testament; if he is to learn moral lessons from its contents, he needs some explanation of its obvious difficulties, some estimate of its place and value in the religious teaching of today. Dr. Stowell's book reminds us of the hitherto unrecorded dictum of an examining chaplain, who remarked, as he wrote *Non Satis* on a candidate's paper, "Mr. Blank may not approve of the Higher Criticism; but he

might give some indication that he has heard of it." Dr. Inskip's book is also disappointing; his addresses, at least in their printed form, are uninspiring. And he appears to give episcopal sanction to some highly debatable interpretations of history, and to treat as indubitable views which, to say the least, are highly controversial.

Mr. Fletcher's small collection of sermons stands in marked contrast. We learn from the Preface that the author has recently celebrated the jubilee of his priesthood. His preaching is representative of the generation of "Ritualistic" clergy who carried into the parishes the Tractarian zeal for supernatural religion, combined with the Tractarian devotion to sound learning. The sermons on sacrifice were preached at All Saints' Church, Margaret Street, in 1891, which was not very long after the year of the publication of *Lux Mundi*. And how superior these sermons are to modern productions! It is true that as they stand they could not be preached to a modern audience. They presuppose a greater familiarity with the contents of the Bible than the congregations of our churches, we fear, possess today. They presuppose a quieter world, an atmosphere more favourable to solid devotion. But none of the sermons in this volume are, like so many modern productions, wasted opportunities. Mr. Fletcher, as a curate at Stepney and Barking, clearly gave time and thought to his sermons such as we moderns seldom give; he prepared for them by careful reading such as we should "find impossible." The lucidity and dignity of his style, the thoroughness and accuracy of his exposition, and the deep devotion to souls which is implied in almost every sentence, render this volume immeasurably superior to the others under review. If the other authors sometimes induced in us the normal state of the Pickwickian Fat Boy, we become Oliver Twist as we read Mr. Fletcher. While respectfully congratulating him on his jubilee, we beg for another volume.

There remains for consideration the series of Broadcast Sermons published by the Student Movement Press. As written apologetic this book deserves high praise; it provides an invaluable defence of the Faith for the educated person, and an excellent corrective and cure for the religious difficulties of those whose intelligence is above the average. The editorial essay by Canon Hodgson is perhaps the most useful section of a most useful book. It is superfluous to praise individual contributors. A course which includes addresses by the Archbishop of York, Dr. Inge, Dr. Edwyn Bevan, and Father D'Arcy, S.J., needs no advertisement. Mr. John Smith cannot complain that these preachers have underestimated his intelligence or failed to provide him with food for thought.

Nevertheless, the value of these essays as broadcast addresses seems open to question. We cannot help wondering whether those who habitually listen in have been attracted by these addresses, or whether they switched off their wireless sets until the time arrived for lighter items of the programme. Our own broadcasting friends, neither particularly ungodly nor particularly lowbrow, certainly adopted the latter alternative. Now the wireless preacher in some ways stands at an advantage over the occupant of the parish pulpit. He has the opportunity of addressing a far larger audience than could be contained in the largest cathedral, and of gaining the attention of persons who never enter any place of worship. On the other hand, he has not the advantage of being subject to the criticism of those whom he addresses. If the pulpit preacher is dull or bad, the fact is brought home to him by the sight of empty pews. The wire-

less preacher has no means of discovering how many of his congregation have "switched off." Moreover, an invisible preacher cannot, like the Ancient Mariner, recall wandering attention by the power of his glittering eye. Even the tones of his voice become flat and metallic over the ether. Hence the wireless preacher, even more than the parish priest, must adopt great simplicity of style and diction. And we venture to think that this is where the distinguished contributors to this course have failed. They have overestimated Mr. John Smith's vocabulary. This failing is most obvious perhaps in the addresses given by representatives of the Church of England; but it is not confined to them. Even Father D'Arcy seems to suffer from Anglican tendencies in this respect.

Canon Barry, who contributes the final address, makes an apologia for the course which is not altogether adequate. We agree with him that the intellectual nature of the course cannot be justly regarded as intrinsically objectionable. But we also agree with him when he states that "it doesn't in the least follow that because a thing is serious and thoughtful it need therefore become unintelligible. . . . The real test of mastery in a subject is ability to teach it to children." It is precisely in the lack of this ability that all the contributors, except Miss Maude Royden, seem to fail. And we are afraid that Miss Royden succeeds only by avoiding any intellectual appeal. She reiterates the thesis, "Beauty is Truth, Truth Beauty," and the objection to this thesis is that the plain man is convinced that these qualities are not identical, while the mystic or philosopher believes that this is *not* all he knows on earth, and that he needs to know a great deal more. But an anecdote contained in Miss Royden's address provides us with an apt analogy to the failure of these addresses to pass Canon Barry's test. She tells how a lecturer, after describing crystals to an audience of children, exclaimed: "If we may think of the atom as the letter in Nature's alphabet, and the molecule as her word, surely we may think of the crystal as her sonnet!" "Is that not poetry? And is it not true?" asks Miss Royden. We reply: "Yes, but did the children understand?" So when Dr. N. P. Williams informs us that "we shall only be able to square the facts of life with the hypothesis that this God is Love, if we can discern reasons for believing that His control of cosmic and human history is shaped in accordance with a plan, directed towards the realization of a supremely valuable end, but an end of such a nature that, whilst its consummation necessarily involves the elimination or conquest of everything incompatible with it, the process of its realization inevitably involves at least the theoretical possibility of temporary aberrations from or contradictions of it," we can only comment: "Is that not metaphysics? And is it not true? But do the children understand?"

HUMPHRY BEEVOR.

WESTMINSTER COMMENTARIES: THE FIRST AND SECOND EPISTLES TO THE THESSALONIANS. Edited by E. J. Bicknell, D.D. Methuen. 8s.

Some of the books of the Bible tend to be neglected by the ordinary reader because, while he perhaps knows that they contain problems which demand serious study, the issues involved seem vague and barren, and the material necessary for considering them hard to come by. If any have felt reluctant to embark upon the Epistles to the Thessalonians for some such reasons as these, let them now take heart. For in this commentary Dr. Bicknell has fulfilled the purposes of the Westminster

series admirably, shewing what the problems of these Epistles are, why they are vital at the present time, and how modern scholarship sets about solving them. In the compass of 150 pages will be found a straightforward introduction, a simple analysis of the material, an adequate and clear commentary, and a number of illuminating detached notes.

One of these notes, however, provokes a criticism, not of the substance of Dr. Bicknell's work, but of its form. "Faith, Hope and Love" are treated in rather more than twelve pages of small type. It is indeed necessary that the background of important words should be examined, and their various appearances throughout Biblical literature discussed, if their use in a particular place is to be fully understood. But must the student digest a note of such magnitude as this each time he studies a book of the Bible which has something to say upon a particular theme? However illuminating in itself, a lengthy note on "Faith, Hope and Love" is bound to be largely superfluous to any who have studied other New Testament writings. This would not matter, did it not tend to be wearisome, and so to obscure that which is original and which pertains particularly to the context. But how could Dr. Bicknell have avoided this excursus? It is forced upon him by his undertaking to write a self-sufficing commentary. It may be hoped, however, that the day of these individual commentaries on individual books is passing, and that Biblical exegesis will soon forge for itself some new form of commentary that will combine comprehensiveness and accessibility with economy of effort.

One small point. Ought a quite legitimate department of exegesis to be introduced quite like this: in discussing Apocalyptic (and again in discussing Antichrist) Dr. Bicknell asks, "What value can we ourselves find in such language?" Shall I be justified in asking, "What value can I find in the fact that Jesus was a Jew?" Is not this humiliating fact valuable first of all because it relentlessly bows my Gentile head under its yoke? And, similarly, is not Apocalyptic eternally and objectively valid first of all because it scandalizes the scientific rationalism of the nations? Which does not mean that a primitive Christian, or a Jewish, conception of the world has any special authority as a mode of thought, but simply that the fact that Jesus used Apocalyptic must render my intellectual position questionable—while the converse (unless we are persuaded that the New Testament has no objective historical significance) is unthinkable.

NOEL DAVEY.

CONVERSION. By A. D. Nock. Oxford University Press. 15s.

The task undertaken in this book is new, and without question most valuable. The phenomenon of the Church as a converting body is considered from the viewpoint of contemporary paganism, and in relation to those notions of religious change and conversion which it already possessed. The scope of the book is best indicated by its subtitle, "The Old and the New in Religion, from Alexander the Great to Augustine of Hippo." How far, Professor Nock asks, could an average citizen of the empire recognize in Christianity traits which would help him to "place" it? What was there in religion as he knew it that might enforce the claim of the new faith to his consideration? To attempt an answer to such questions, one must possess an intimate knowledge of the life of the period on its religious side. Such knowledge is rare, and Professor Nock is a master of it. And he has become a master of it, in part at least, because he has brought to the appreciation of pagan religion a sane

and human sympathy. It is this last fact that lends the book its charm; while in the accomplishment of its main task it forms a contribution to knowledge, and certainly to easily accessible knowledge, of the most substantial order. People's ideas about the expansion of the Church in this period, and the conversions by which it was effected, have been too much distorted by untrue and even grotesque notions of the external world which conditioned it.

From such a knowledge of the subject as Professor Nock commands, he has been able to draw amazing numbers of parallels in non-Christian connections to Christian ways of thought, religious experiences, and liturgical practice. And yet, strangely enough, the final result is that we are made to feel how different were ancient ideas of religion from those which Christianity has caused to become the common property of modern culture.

Of particular results which the book achieves, one of the most noteworthy is its opposition to the vogue which the mystery religions have enjoyed, at the expense of what may be called the "classical" religion of the Greco-Roman world. It reduces very much the importance of Mithraism, as compared with the proportions attributed to it in many recent works. And a special interest attaches to the discussion, in chapter viii., of the connection between the progressive infiltration of foreign cults at Rome during the second and third centuries, and the change in composition of the ruling classes there over the same period.

The reader whose chief interest is the bearing of all this upon Christian history may experience a sense of disappointment as he reads the last three chapters, in which Christianity forms a direct subject of examination. The tints in which Christian experience are depicted seem somehow to have got assimilated to the subdued tones of their pagan background. Perhaps, even, a pagan Lucius is more interesting, in these pages, than a Christian Justin, though the facts should make it otherwise. But is it fair to ask of a writer that he should acquit himself of more than one task? Professor Nock has offered to set us in the pagan world of the first four Christian centuries, so that we may take an *external* view of the Christian movement. The thirty pages of notes at the end of the book give some faint notion of the study that has gone to the task, while the text, disencumbered of the apparatus of learning, offers to the non-specialist reader, in clear and readable form, an acquaintance with a most interesting as well as valuable field of knowledge.

W. TELFER.

STUDIES IN THE CHARACTER OF CHRIST. The Right Rev. Arthur Karney, D.D., Bishop of Southampton, formerly Bishop of Johannesburg. A. R. Mowbray and Co., Ltd. 1s. 6d.

THE LIFE IN CHRIST: A DEVOTIONAL STUDY. The Rev. A. O. Hardy, Head of the Dublin University Mission, Chota Nagpur. A. R. Mowbray and Co., Ltd. 2s. 6d.

THE WILL TO LOVE. Rev. W. E. Lutyens, Priest of the Oratory of the Good Shepherd. S.P.C.K. 2s.

WATCHERS BY THE CROSS. Canon Peter Green. Longmans, Green and Co. 3s. 6d.

THE SCHOOL OF CHARITY. Evelyn Underhill. Longmans, Green and Co. 2s. 6d.

A central stillness is common to all these books. It is more than quietness or serenity; it is a stillness of depth. There is no place here for the

Broken shadows of a humanistic Christianity, for as each writer deals with some aspect of that fundamental truth which is summed up in the Pauline phrase "in Christ" we become aware that we are looking at the Christian life "*sub specie æternitatis*"—as part of an eternal process focussed in the Person of the Divine Lord. The note of austerity is not wanting, for it is a necessary consequence of the contact between the finite and the infinite, the Divine purpose and the human will. The Bishop of Southampton takes some of the qualities shown in the Incarnate Life first as the basis of these meditations and then as tests for self-examination. Thus their appeal will be to a far wider circle than the clergy to whom they were first addressed.

In Mr. Hardy's series of parables familiar things are given a new significance. The self, the family, the Church are so many settings for the unfolding of the central life. All else is preliminary to that and incomplete without it, and from it alone can grow the fruits of full life.

By striking phrase or beautiful verse Canon Lutyens draws his readers along a road of high adventure in the life in Christ which is yet not beyond the reach of "ordinary Christians" who have the faith and courage to attempt it.

Canon Peter Green speaks the language of sanctified common sense which he knows so well how to use even in dealing with the deepest mysteries of the faith. Again and again the point and meaning in ordinary life of the mystery of the Cross is set in some homely story or in some literary allusion. But always the purpose is clear—it was "for us men and for our salvation" that that deep mystery was consummated.

Miss Underhill's book is justly described by the Bishop of London as a noble book. Its thought moves on the highest plane. But while it deals with Reality in its true sense, God, it is never out of touch with the actual conditions through which that Reality is manifested. "The Divine generosity" is a warmer term even than the Divine charity, and a sense of that generosity glows and sparkles all through this beautiful exposition of the verities of faith.

J. R. PRIDIE.

THE SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE OXFORD MOVEMENT. W. G. Peck.
Scribners. Pp. 346. 7s. 6d. net.

After the flood of centenary publications, which have re-examined from every possible angle the leading personalities among the Tractarians, or retold the now somewhat threadbare story of the diffusion of "Catholic practice," with its attendant series of brawls and prosecutions, Mr. Peck's Hale Lectures have the real advantage of dealing with a distinctive and important aspect of the Movement, its influence upon the social thinking of the Church during the succeeding century.

His main position will be familiar to those who are acquainted with the work of the Anglo-Catholic Summer School of Sociology, and with the writings of the group of men and women particularly associated with it. With the essentials of their theological position there are probably few who would wish to quarrel. Indeed, it is a matter of real thankfulness that the recognition of the doctrines of the Incarnation and of the Church and Sacraments, as the foundation on which alone can be built any view of human nature and society which will be able to deliver mankind from the alternative tyrannies of economic individualism and

economic collectivism, is no longer a monopoly of any one section of Christian thought. And, scanty and somewhat ambiguous as the evidence of the Tractarians' own views on the social implications of their teaching appears to be, we have at least the right to trace back to their original insistence upon the Church as a spiritually autonomous society much of what has become more explicit in later thinking.

It is in the sphere of his own economic and sociological implications that criticism of Mr. Peck's book is likely to arise. Again there will be little dissent from his two main contentions: that a purely "humanistic" estimate of life, in the sense of one which seeks to define human value in terms of economic satisfaction, is bound to end in spiritual starvation; and that an economic system, which completely replaces the satisfaction of human need by the profit-making motive as its incentive, is as likely to lead to material bankruptcy. But his presentation of the case inevitably raises the questions whether the presence of these vicious tendencies in our civilization is as closely associated as he implies with the organization of society on a "capitalist" basis, and indeed whether the achievement of the last hundred years, if not of the whole period since the Reformation, deserves quite as unqualified denunciation as it receives at his hands.

The fashion of lamentation or diatribe, which now appears to be the only possible mode of treating "the end of our age," is calculated by itself to produce either despair, or a perhaps not unhealthy reaction. Meanwhile there remains the practical issue of living through the immediate critical period of the present. And, while Mr. Peck has some valuable things to say in his concluding chapter on the function of the Church in the new "leisure age" which is to be expected, one could wish that he had devoted more space to the even more urgent question of how the heart of man is to be turned from the pursuit of false ends to the recognition of these true values in which, as he clearly sees, lies salvation.

F. A. C.

GOD AND THE ASTRONOMERS. By W. R. Inge. Longmans. 12s. 6d.

Here the Dean of St. Paul's is at his splendid best. Nothing can be done in a short notice except urge educated Christians to read his book, which deals with the most fundamental question of our generation. The Second Law of Thermodynamics, or the principle of Entropy, teaches that, while energy is conserved, available energy is lessening, so that ultimately it will be uniformly dispersed. The world, that is to say, is running down. The Dean has no difficulty in shewing that the physics textbooks conceal a crude Deism. If the cosmic process as we know it is coming to an end in time, it must have begun in time. We are thrown back to creation, to a power which wound up the clock that is running down. Popular sentiment, in the face of these scientific truths, still clings to the conventional idea of evolution, expressed even by so great a man as Darwin, as leading to the millennium. The theological importance of the doctrine of entropy is considerable. If God is only the soul of the universe, He will die with the universe. The Second Law seems to necessitate a transcendent God. Further, the certain end of the world makes it impossible to find any sure satisfaction for human aspirations in a perfected humanity living on this planet.

Christians, in so far as they are true to the historic faith, are not perturbed by the scientists' conclusions. They, at any rate, never have seen in this planet the permanent dwelling place of our race. The very conception of Progress is modern and is hard to justify. Readers of Dr. Inge's *Plotinus* will not be surprised to find him here repeating his exposition of a realm of eternal values unaffected by the hypotheses of the scientists.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH AND THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. By R. H. Malden. Oxford University Press.

"But if anyone is willing to look for the Church which is actually making the most honest and whole-hearted effort to teach the truth which God has revealed, adding nothing to it and withholding nothing, I do not think that he will spend his strength in vain or that his faith will go unrewarded. Nor do I doubt where it will lead him to make his spiritual home" (p. 74).

Thus the Dean of Wells ends this book. There is no doubt that he has achieved very adequately that which he set out to do. It may, however, perhaps be regretted that he set out to do it. For his book, designed, indeed, to counterbalance the "claims" of the Roman Church, in fact commends the Church of England. But if we begin again to commend ourselves, must it not be supposed that we need commendation?

NOEL DAVEY.

ANIMA CHRISTI. By H. Leonard Pass, B.D. S.P.C.K. 6s.

THE RICHES OF CHRIST. By Bede Frost. Centenary Press. 3s. 6d.

The sub-title of the former of these two books—"A little treatise on the spiritual life"—indicates its object. It is packed with sound teaching and wise advice about the various stages and experiences of the spiritual life from its earliest beginnings to its consummation. With some ingenuity the author has succeeded in adapting the course of his exposition to the text of the *Anima Christi*, thereby investing a well-worn subject with real freshness and originality. It is unfortunate that the effect is to some extent spoiled by a certain monotony of style, and this is not relieved by the way in which the book is paragraphed. Constantly single paragraphs run over two or three pages or more. On the other hand, an attractive feature of the book is the number of apt citations from religious poetry, specially from Dante, that are introduced as illustrations. Its freedom from technicalities of expression will make it readily intelligible to the general reader; but it will probably appeal most to those who may be described as being "spiritually sophisticated."

In an interesting appendix the evidence about the authorship, date, etc., of the *Anima Christi* is set out. The index would be useful if it indicated the pages where references occur; as it is, it is merely an alphabetical list of names.

The Riches of Christ, by Father Bede Frost, is a valuable addition to the number of books which contain readings for each of the forty days of Lent. Each reading provides ample material for daily meditation.

A. R. VIDLER.

BOOK NOTES

From Pulpit to Pew. By Basil G. Bourchier. Skeffington. 5s. Characteristically vigorous sermons, dealing with the rights of animals, social injustice, the Three Hours' Devotion, and the life of a soldier.

The Making of Europe. By Christopher Dawson. 8s. 6d. *Practical Psychology.* By Rudolf Allers. 4s. 6d. Sheed and Ward. These are cheap editions of valuable books reviewed by us in September, 1932, and November, 1931, respectively. The same publishers reissue Karl Adam's *The Spirit of Catholicism* at 3s. 6d. W. K. L. C.

INDEX TO VOLUME XXVIII

JANUARY—JUNE, 1934

	PAGE
A. G. H.	103
APPASAMY, A. J.	318
BALMFORTH, H.	224
BARNES, C.R., R. L.	138
Books Reviewed:	
Canterbury Administration. By I. J. Churchill	169
Christian Life, The. Vol. I. Standards. Edited by Oscar Hardman	348
Christianity in Celtic Lands. By Dom Louis Gougaud	107
Conception of God in the Philosophy of Aquinas, The. By R. L. Patterson	346
Counter Attack from the East. By C. E. M. Joad	226
Gospel of Modernism, The. By R. D. Richardson	224
Literature and Pulpit in Mediæval England. By G. R. Owst.	284
Northern Catholicism. Edited by N. P. Williams and C. Harris	47
Oxford Handbook of Religious Knowledge, The	344
Story of S.C.M., The. By T. Tatlow	110
BEZZANT, J. S.	348
BROWNE-WILKINSON, A. R.	344
BUCHANAN, M.	35
BULGAKOV, SERGIUS	23
Catholic Youth Movement, A	265
Christian Faith and Modern Scepticism, The	77
Christian Stewardship	334
Church Assembly, The	26
Civilization and the Faith	67
CLARKE, W. K. LOWTHER	203, 282, 334
Clerical Discipline	43
COOK, A. A.	6
"Commons" of the 1928 Prayer Book, The	282
Communism and the Groups in China.	222
Confession	102
Corpus Christi	246
Correspondence	44, 163, 277, 334
DAWSON, CHRISTOPHER	67
DIX, O.S.B., GREGORY	125, 187
Editorial	1, 61, 121, 181, 241, 301
FROST, MAURICE	219
HANKOW, The Bishop of	222
HEBERT, S.S.M., A. G.	346
HOLLAND, HENRY SCOTT	102
HUDSON, C. E.	77
Indian Visitor to the Holy Land, An	318
Interpreter Spirit, The	85, 148
Is there a Christian Apologetic?	6
JAMES, J. L. BEAUMONT	47
JENKINS, CLAUDE	107
KIDDLE, M.	95
Lamb of God: Concerning the God-Man, The	23

	PAGE
LEACH, N. K.	307
Licensing Confessors	215, 338
Little Sermon for Easter, A	185
MACBEAN, G. K.	156
MACDONALD, A. J.	85, 148
MACKENZIE, K. D.	338
MOORMAN, J. R. H.	165
MUKERJI, CHUNI	226
Mystery of Jesus walking on the Sea, The	272
Note on Self-Examination, A	165
Notes and Comments	43, 102, 163
Notes on Periodicals	45, 104, 164, 223, 283, 342
Origins of the Epiclesis, The	125, 187
Prayer without Theism	254
Public School's Experiment, A	167
Reparation	307
ROBERTS, R. ELLIS	246
ROBINSON, F. DOUGLAS	278
Saul and David	95
Sense of the Past, The	203
S. H. C.	167
SIMPSON, W. J. SPARROW	215
SÖDERBLOM, ARCHBISHOP	103
Some Fishing Stories in the Gospels	35
SPENS, MAISIE	272
Te Deum Laudamus	219
THOMPSON, A. HAMILTON	169
TILLYARD, ÆLFRIDA	110
Towards Reunion	156
Values in Recent Evangelistic Movements	138
Veni Creator Spiritus	278
WELLS, The Dean of	26
W. F. M.	284
WINCKWORTH, PETER	265
WODEHOUSE, HELEN	254

